

# FROM WORDS TO ACTION: THE GUADALAJARA SUMMIT AND THE PROPOSALS BY FROM LATIN AMERICAN, CARIBBEAN AND EUROPEAN CIVIL SOCIETY<sup>1</sup>

**Jorge Balbis**

San José de Costa Rica

August 2004

## **I. Background**

**1. Events "prior" to the III LAC-EU Summit.** Several Latin American governments and the European Commission supported a number of meetings prior to the summit involving civil society to "*enrich and provide contents to the birregional strategic association*". This meant starting again with a practice established at the I Summit (Rio de Janeiro, 1999) which led to an increasing number of events parallel to each subsequent summit. (Participants in these events have become increasingly numerous and diverse, including from civil society, labor unions, NGOs, business, etc., academe, parliamentarians, cities, etc.). The meetings prior to the III Summit were organized in different formats, took place in various countries and related to range of conditions, topics and priorities set by the strategic EU-LAC Association, and, in particular the agenda for the Guadalajara meeting. According to its Mexican organizers, the recommendations for those meetings will be included as "*supporting documentation*" to the preparations for the Summit

The 15 previous events include several meetings on social cohesion between the European Commission and the IDB; the meeting of LAC-EU university networks; the meeting of parliamentarians; birregional (official) meetings on migration; an URBAL Program conference to determine the conclusions and perspectives of decentralized cooperation among local EU and LA collective organizations in the field of urban policy-making; the II Euro-Latin American-Caribbean Forum of civil society; a meeting of ECSA Associations in Latin America; a seminar on cultural industries; the III Meeting of Organized Civil Society from Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean; the II EU-LAC Summit, the complete list of preparatory events can be seen at [www.alcuel.org/alcuel/web/cumbre1.php](http://www.alcuel.org/alcuel/web/cumbre1.php) and in [www.europa.eu.int/comm/world/lac-guadal/00\\_index.htm](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/world/lac-guadal/00_index.htm)

**2.** This practice is "in line" with the European Commission policy to "involve" "non-State players" (in particular, from Europe) in the debate and implementation of strategies, procedures, initiatives, events, etc, both internal to the European Union as international.

Concerning relationships with LAC, the role played by the European Economic and Social Committees (EESC) late in prior summits (EESC called three "Meetings of *Organized* Civil Society from Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean" for a like number of Summits); the negotiations and implementation of association agreements (with Mexico, Chile and

---

<sup>1</sup> Draft. Unpublished copy prepared for Rimisp-Latin American Center for Rural Development in the framework of the ICCO (Inter-ecleciastic organization for Cooperation for Development, Holland), Euforic (South-North Exchange Platform), and the Society for International Development (SID), on EU cooperation policies with LA.

MERCOSUR); in the "fora" or "conferences" with or by civil society organizations as regards Mexico and Central America; in consultations with Civil Society, academe and business with respect to the European Union, MERCOSUR and Chile negotiations, etc.

**3.** Usually, initiatives for this type of meetings come from European organizations/institutions with financial support and recognition from Community authorities (from the Commission in particular). Civil society from Latin America and the Caribbean is "invited" to join these initiatives. However, it is worthwhile underscoring the growing protagonism assumed by some Latin American organizations/institutions in materializing several of these initiatives. They include the case of ALOP in the Alcobendas Fora in Spain (2002) and the Pátzcuaro, Mexico meeting (in 2004), or the Latin American Center for Relations with Europe's (CELARE) seminar on "Political and congressional contributions to the III EU-LAC Summit", that took place in Santiago the Chile in January, 2004. In these cases:

a) Most of the funding for these events is provided directly or indirectly by European institutions (the Commission and/or the Parliament) while the Latin America funding contributions is comparably very small;

b) It is extremely hard for Latin American governments to "recognize" the value of these efforts and, in addition, often times there foreign affairs ministries do not appreciate or show interest in these manifestations of the citizen's protagonism in what they feel is the exclusive field of their diplomatic activity.

**4.** Official recognition of preparatory activities for the Summits gives these efforts a distinctive recognition by European authorities. However this fact must be reminded to and/or confirmed by Latin American authorities every time these meetings are called. An exception was the Mexican government during the last summit when Mexican authorities even "*competed*" with the European Commission for sponsoring (and even partially funding) several numerous events prior to the Guadalajara Meeting. In addition, for the first time in the history of EU-LAC Summits, the host-country government committed to present and promote the results of these preparatory meetings before the High Officials charged with preparing the Final Summit Declaration. Finally, as a conclusion to this effort, a "*presentation*" of the meeting's results was organized for the foreign affairs ministers gathering in Guadalajara.<sup>2</sup>

**5.** Outside the official Summit circuit, other events the official meeting organizers called peripheral or parallel were "*alternative to*" or "*against*" the official meeting's objectives and contents (and, in particular, concerning their limitations). The eventual contributions of these initiatives have even smaller chances of being taken into account (and even of being accepted and/or heard) by the authorities. At the time when they took place (parallel to

---

<sup>2</sup> Although this was a first such event, as it was organized it turned to be rather a public relations exercise instead of an event from which concrete results could be expected. Clearly, the possibility of "*conveying*" the message from these events to include them in the Declaration, disappeared long before the actual summit date. The high officials concluded the draft declaration towards April 27, so the Guadalajara initiative have a number of other meanings: to "officially accept" the results of the events, to demonstrate the efforts of Mexican authorities, etc.

the Summit) the tenor of their call and some protest to which they were related clearly prevented their inclusion in the official meetings dynamics, although this was not necessarily an objective they pursued or a result desired by their organizers.<sup>3</sup>

**6.** The Summit's Agenda was the subject of a long debate among the European side (represented by the European Commission and the Irish EU Chairmanship) and the Latin American and Caribbean sides (with a special protagonism by Mexico as the meeting's host country and, in particular its Ambassador before the EU, Porfirio Muñoz Ledo, together with Latin American governments' representatives in Brussels). The European Commission decided to focus the Summit on the issue of social cohesion to prevent the scattering that had characterized previous meetings' agendas, and as an attempt to reach some concrete results in four related areas (education, health, fiscal reform and access to justice). However, neither the Mexican ambassador nor some Latin American representatives in Europe—in particular from Brazil—were enthusiastic about limiting the agenda. At that time, with the purpose of closing the area for debate and encourage Latin American governments to join its proposed agenda, in June 23 the Commission organized together with IDB and ECOLAC, a seminar on social cohesion that focussed strongly on some issues that Latin American governments did not welcome, as they considered the approach to the problems of poverty and inequality that the Commission tried to convey from the Seminar to the Summit was "reductionist" and centered on a European view. As a consequence of the Seminar that took place in Brussels in June 2003, a follow up group was created including representatives from the Commission, UNDP, ECOLAC and some European and Latin American governments. This group prepared a document that finally was included as an additional input to the meeting's preparation (but was not an official document for the meeting to be included as an annex to the Final Declaration as wished by Community authorities).

See: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/la/sc/index.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/la/sc/index.htm)

For their part, Latin American governments made a counter proposal for the agenda including the issue of social cohesion from the perspective of the three components of relations with the EU (political dialogue, trade and development cooperation), the treatment of each of those aspects was broken down into a number of sub-issues that included, for instance, international peace and security, democratic governments (interdependence between democracy and economic and social development), the struggle against poverty, migration, sub regional integration, foreign debt, the international financial architecture, the multilateral trade system, the scientific and technological gap, human capital building to defeat poverty, etc. Annex I includes an outline of the draft agenda prepared by Latin American and Caribbean governments for the Summits.

Lastly, the agenda included two central topics: social cohesion and multilateralism. Each of these was broken down in a number of sub-themes including regional integration, democratic governance, international financial architecture, cooperation for development in science, education, technology and culture, etc. These topics were used to link the agendas of the preparatory events which, from several viewpoints and to various degrees

---

<sup>3</sup> The most evident case in this respect was the "Linking Alternatives" Forum called among other organizations by RMALC and Continental Social Alliance that took place in Guadalajara parallel to the Summit.

of emphasis, prepared a long list of recommendations for the Summit. The corresponding documents may be seen at:

[www.alcuel.org/alcuel/web/cumbre1.php](http://www.alcuel.org/alcuel/web/cumbre1.php)

**7.** However, the impact from these contributions to the Summit Declaration may be regarded as very modest. The reasons include:

a) As was mentioned earlier, the Latin American foreign offices were not involved in these efforts, despite the good disposition shown by some Mexican government instances in particular for this Summit. In most cases, that is also true for the European foreign offices that discussed the contents of the Summit agreements with their Latin American and Caribbean peers. Regardless of the goodwill shown by the European Commission toward these practices, the political and bureaucratic barriers built by the European Union's member states to such efforts hamper to a large degree their eventual influence on the results of birregional meetings.

b) The lack of acknowledged institutional jurisdictions to channel these proposals within the Summits' dynamic conditions their likely impact in obtaining support and goodwill from the organizers of official meetings that may facilitate conveying such proposals or achieving this goal through other relationships or in circumstances outside the Summits themselves.<sup>4</sup>

c) The wide range of topics and diversity of scope of many proposals issuing from these preparatory events makes it difficult to include them in the language resulting from the summits.

d) The generic nature of the Declaration, including practically every issue proposed at the previous events (excluding some notorious omissions, such as the Colombian conflict and the Cuba embargo, for instance), though without including concrete and/or binding commitments in practically any of them.

## **II. Civil Society Proposals for the Guadalajara Meeting**

**1.** Before describing the proposals made by Civil Society to the III EU-LAC Summit we must recall the diverse and heterogeneous proposals, objectives, approaches and make up

---

<sup>4</sup> This is the case of EESC which as an official European organization has a certain capacity to impact community authorities lacking other actors involved in initiatives evolving simultaneously with the summit. The results of the III Meeting of Organized Civil Society from Europe-LAC were consequently included to the larger extent in the talks by high officials since debate participants were involved from the "insight" as members of the European delegation that discussed in Brussels together with their LAC counterparts the draft Guadalajara Declaration. Mexican Civil Society had the opportunity of sending two representatives (one from Mexican Unions and another from NGOs) as members of the official Mexican government delegation to the Summit. In this way, several events (e.g. the Union Summit or the Pátzcuaro Forum) included representatives within the Summit who conveyed some ideas through the Mexican delegation. This was the exception to the rule. No other official delegation to the Summit included representatives from Civil Society.

that result from the 15 previous events (although they did not all include civil society representatives), such as those organized in preparation for Guadalajara.<sup>5</sup>

There are obvious differences in perspectives and emphasis among the proposals, as well as some significant lacks regarding matters of political difficulty (the cases of Colombia and Cuba for instance, which are not included in the Declaration made by the III Organized Civil Society Meeting, called for by EESC), or the numerous issues brought up by certain sectors (such as debate and social consensus-building included in the Declaration from the II Trade Union Meeting) that were not included in any other event. In addition, many of the recommendations are directly addressed to Latin American governments and cannot be easily discussed in the framework of a birregional summit of heads of state and government.

Taking into account these observations, while drafting this paper on the impact of civil society meetings at the III EU-LAC Summit on the Guadalajara Declaration, we paid special attention to the recommendations resulting from the three events and their clear social characteristics:

- The II European Latin American Caribbean Forum of Civil Society organized by ALOP and several social organizations and networks from Latin American, Mexico and Europe (Pátzcuaro, March, 24-26);
- III European, Latin American and Caribbean organized civil society meeting organized by EESC, the European Commission and the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Mexico, April, 13-15);
- II EU-LAC Trade Union Meeting organized by European and Latin American trade union federations (Mexico, April 16).

**2.** An analysis of the Final Declarations issued at these three events allowed to identify a number of recurring topics and recommendations for the III Summit, in particular:

- **Multilateralism:** The EU-LAC alliance could contribute to foster multilateralism, particularly in the political area, as well as sustainable development supported by economic, social and environmental underpinnings. This alliance should promote good governance based on the consensus of nations and respect for international law and commitments buttressing the planet's environmental and social balance (Monterrey Consensus, Johannesburg, etc.). It is also appropriate to promote transparent and democratic mechanisms in negotiations and decision-making, both at the WTO and in international financial negotiations. To make further progress along this line, it is crucial for countries to ratify the International Criminal Court.
- **Democracy:** The EU and LAC countries must provide resolute support to the consolidation of democratic processes; the end of political violence; and the

---

<sup>5</sup> For instance the III Meeting of Organized Civil Society from Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean called by EESC brought together members from the corporate, labor, consumer and cooperative communities (a third sector community perhaps); the Pátzcuaro forum brought together NGOs and some representatives from social movements; the III Labor Union Summit involved participants from labor; the Linking Options forum involved social organizations and movements close to the World Labor Union Forum, etc.

eradication of corruption and impunity. It is thought that institutionalized corruption and illegality destroy the basic ethical, regulatory and community links required for social coexistence. Consequently, more severe penalties are proposed against officials involved in corruption crimes.

- **Social Cohesion:** To achieve greater social cohesion in LAC countries, an agenda of concrete actions is required evolving Civil Society in its drafting, development and implementation. It is thought necessary to focus initiatives on the most vulnerable sectors (women, children, young people, senior citizens, the disabled, and indigenous and African descent populations). Comprehensive compliance with, and enforcement and juridical nature of DESCs is required. In this regard, integration processes or talks to enter association agreements underway should include well defined and measurable goals, including the eradication of poverty, hunger, mortality and malnutrition, extreme unemployment and precarious jobs, and the end of pressures exerted on weak social security and solidarity structures, etc.
- **Dignified work and employments:** A key aspect in promoting social cohesion is the creation of dignified jobs and employment. In this respect, a demand is made for the unrestricted respect for agreements concerning human rights, including labour rights comprised in the ILO agreements. Multinational corporations, in particular European ones, should perform a major role beyond regulations in force in LAC countries, to promote respect for labour and environmental rights through voluntary initiatives in the area of their social responsibility. Thus, a relationship between the EU and LAC countries could contribute to developing a structured labour market, providing decent jobs and including institutional arrangements to promote negotiations between social interlocutors.
- **Fiscal reform:** To the extent inequality is a fundamental aspect of LAC social problems, a demand is made for tax reforms based on social criteria that will make progress towards redistributing wealth. These reforms must introduce deep reforms in the existing tax and spending structures and should be directed at levying taxes from higher income groups.
- **Foreign Debt:** Foreign debt payments impede financing economic and social development policies. A demand is made to place this issue at the top of the political dialog agenda between the European Union and LAC countries. The legitimacy of each case should be reviewed with a view at rescheduling or condoning the debt. The people's right to development should have precedence over debt repayments.
- **Regional integration:** This is recognized as a key element in creating a birregional relationship that will further social cohesion. Regional integration can foster integrated and articulated economic development that takes account of national and regional asymmetries by fostering efficient and effective economies, and introducing measures to lure foreign investment. Pursuant to the objective of promoting social cohesion, a call is made for integration that will not be exclusively economic but which will also promote "convergence between and within countries".

- **Association agreements:** A call is made to conclude negotiations between EU and MERCOSUR in coming months so that this agreement, in addition to a *"balanced trade treatment"*, shall include political, social labour and cultural dimensions. A claim is made for a significant, balanced and reciprocal market opening (both bi and intraregional). Some even proclaim the need to redesign existent agreements so as to include a recognition for those asymmetries, clauses relating to preferential and differentiated treatment, exclusion of sensitive economic sectors, and compensation funds. A call is also made to *"promote"* similar talks between EU and the CAN and Central America. Like once, negotiations should be quickly started in the framework of the Cotonou agreement concerning associations pacts between the European Union and Caribbean countries. Finally, a call is made for all past and future agreements between the European Union and LAC's countries and regions should include *"a high component of the social dimension, the promotion and strengthening of social organizations and participatory bodies, and consultations with organized civil societies"*.
- **Cooperation:** A call is made to preserve the amounts of European cooperation with LAC, and for greater efficiency in their use and compliance by the EU of its commitment to allocate 0.7% of its GDP to cooperate within a clear schedule for implementation, while simultaneously seeking new types of revenue distribution in the national and international spheres, including social compensation funds, taxes on capital transfers and funds created on the basis of international common goods. Support is provided to creating a Birregional Solidarity Fund (a proposal approved by the European Parliament but which so far has not been funded by the Commission). A request is made for improved coordination in cooperation matters between the European Commission and the EU member States.

In view that all association agreements include a cooperation component, it was thought they should be redrafted for greater consistency with the objective of promoting social cohesion. Finally, in what concerns the so-called "Social Initiative" (presently EUROsociAL) a request was made for such initiative to take account of regional peculiarities and for it to provide effective involvement of Civil Society and resources in line with its magnitude.

- **Migration:** The issue of migration should be included as a matter of joint responsibility in the EU-LAC agenda. A call is made for the respect to the individual rights of the migrants and the recognition of dignity and cultural contribution. A request is made for effectively fighting against organized criminal people-trafficking, and the standardization of foreign citizenry laws to provide the greatest possible protection.
- **Civil society:** All declarations recognized and confirmed the important role of civil society in EU-LAC relationships, and requested to include civil society's effective involvement in integration processes, present and future association agreements and the Summits themselves. To this end, a call is made for greater access to information, carrying out consultations and introducing ways to have an impact on decision making processes.

- **Colombia:** Political negotiation is confirmed as a way to resolve the conflict while a request is made to all parties to stop the armed actions.
- **Cuba:** A request was made to ask the United States to lift the embargo against Cuba and to foster a renewed political dialog that will conclude in a cooperation agreement between the European Union and Cuba.

### III. Summit results

According to some analysts, the Guadalajara Summit has shown a sense of vitality in the EU-LAC relationships, partly from a preparatory process that involved a large member of actors, both governmental and non-governmental, and in particular, from Civil Society, even though the latter is not granted due recognition. However, if we abide by the contents of the Summit's Final Declarations, the balance is less optimistic, even though so if we compare its contents with the ambitious list of wishes expressed by Civil Society we have just described, and even if it also addresses some questions of major interest that had not been previously addressed in prior Civil Society events. See [www.alcue.org/alcue/web/doctos/Declaracion\\_Final\\_REESTRUCTURADA.pdf](http://www.alcue.org/alcue/web/doctos/Declaracion_Final_REESTRUCTURADA.pdf).

The final section of this analysis will present a comparative analysis based on the Declaration's review prepared by José A. Sanahuja (in print)<sup>6</sup>.

According to Sanahuja, the contents of the Guadalajara Declaration may be construed as follows:

- Regarding the **commitment to multilateralism and the principles of the United Nation's chart:** It ratifies the principles of sovereignty, non intervention and sovereign equality among States, and recalls the government's obligations concerning human rights and democracy (point 3 of the Declaration). It confirm the "central" role of the United States and commits to improve its efficiency, supports its reform, (points 12 and 13) and its contribution to regional organizations in the fields of international peace and security (points 8 and 11). Nevertheless, in prior debate, some divergences emerge concerning the interventions that brought out humanitarian reasons and which have created particular reluctant in LA, especially when no UN mandate supports them. This same multilateral approach has proposed before the threat of creating mass destruction weapons, to which Latin America concern about light weapons was added (point 16).
- Concerning **the role of the United States:** The Guadalajara Declaration implies, without explicitly mentioning it, an argument against unilateralism a way in which the "war against terror" is waged. Somehow, Guadalajara exposes that the Bush administration is isolated and faces a legitimacy crisis. However, some care was taken so the Declaration would not to include any express reference to the United States, neither concerning international peace and security, nor other issues, such as the International Criminal Court (point 18), personal mines (point 20), or the Kyoto Protocol (point 31). EU explicit veto

---

<sup>6</sup> José A. SANAHUJA: "La Cumbre de Guadalajara: consensos y divergencias en las relaciones Unión Europea-América Latina y el Caribe", in print. *Quórum*, Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, September 2004.

prevented from mentioning the United States in the harsh paragraph condemning torture in Iraq's jails at which the participants declared their "horror" (point 19). The Declaration even exculpates the Bush Administration and awards it a vote of confidence by recognizing its commitment to bring "justice to individuals" responsible for those events while ensuring compliance with International Humanitarian Law.<sup>7</sup>

Likewise, Cuba asked for the Declaration to include a firm condemnation to the unilateral and extraterritorial enforcement of those against international law, a referral to the Helms-Burton act. However, its attempt failed to prosper and the Cuban representative accepted the less explicit European counter proposal. This omission is significant because the Madrid Declaration adopted in the II Summit in May 2002 as well as in previous language, had included such a disapproval, and the result may be construed as a show of Cuba's isolation and its confrontation with the EU.

- The Guadalajara Declaration omits all references to the **Colombian** conflict, and leaves outside the debate and the meetings documents. This may be considered as an achievement of the Uribe administration, but it may also respond to the need of some EU member States to prevent new confrontations with Washington, after the crises created by the Iraq war and the absence of consensus on Colombia in the midst of the EU.

- **Social cohesion** was one of the key Summit issues and, however, as web as concerning cooperation for development, it also most clearly evidences the gap between the ambitious goals of the "birregional strategic association, and the scarcity of available means. From real to Guadalajara, not a single additional Euro has been allocated to finance the agreed goals because of budget restrictions created by a larger EU and expenditure priorities related to the objectives of security and stability in the Balkans, the Near East and Easter Europe. Social cohesion was also addressed in technical meetings between IDB, the Commission, UNDP and ECOLAC. The documents drafted by these organizations reviewed the "vicious circles" linking poverty, inequality, slow economic growth and the government crises that besiege Latin American democracies. Measures were proposed in the fields of democratic governance, social policy, public finance, fiscal reforms and foreign funding (points 41 to 46). The group also contributed to design the main proposal tabled before the Commission in this respect, the "EUROsociAL", the new name for the social initiative, announced two and a half years ago in Madrid for launching in Guadalajara (point 49).

For all these reasons, the Guadalajara results concerning social cohesion remained very limited and are among the Summit's main frustrations. Together with other usual reasons why Latin American countries are precluded from adopting effective policies in the struggle against poverty, the Declaration simply proposes a regional dialog to exchange experiences in this respect.

The only concrete initiative in this respect was the launching of the "EUROsociAL" program described above which received a meagre 30 million Euros allocation included in the

---

<sup>7</sup> This was among the most heatedly debated issues since several Latin American countries\_in particular Cuba and Venezuela\_required and explicit mention to Guantánamo and the US government's responsibilities.

European Commission's Regional Latin American Strategy 2002-2006. In addition, this program will not finance direct initiatives for the struggle against poverty, and will rather aim at designing social policies and providing high level training for Latin American government officials covering European practices in promoting social cohesion. Lastly, it is worth underscoring the systematic (negative?) absence of all reference to the relationship between association agreements (i.e. free trade) and social cohesion, or in other words the inexistence of mechanisms to promote social cohesion when designing such agreements as regards cooperation for development, the Guadalajara Summit brought no new developments.

- The Commission's proposals for the 2002-2006 period concerning **cooperation for development** (points 84 to 93), had already been tabled during the Madrid Summit (and were included in the Regional Strategy for Latin America mentioned above). Consequently, this Summit brought no news although a mechanism had been created to submit birregional projects. Still, the declaration includes criticisms to the communities cooperation, although they appear between the lines. They include insufficient resources (point 86); decision making signed by the EU's lateralism; disappointing coverage, as with the "Alban" scholarship program, although this was a flag initiative of the Madrid Summit (point 87); and weak cooperation in science and technology, as we demand all the region's most advanced nations, including Mexico and Chile (point 93).

- As concerns **association agreements**, the Declaration mentions that the agreements between the European Union and various countries and subregions, whether already signed or in negotiation, "will allow to continue building a birregional strategic association" (point 51). Agreements with Mexico (2000) and Chile (2002) already in place, the agenda of birregional relationships is to a great extent determined by the demands for the EU to sign pending "association agreements" with MERCOSUR, the Andean Communities and Central American countries.<sup>8</sup> The position adopted by the EU at the Madrid Summit was that these agreements will have to wait until the "Doha Round" initially planned for December 2004. Since then, events at the WTO passed the stagnating FTAA project and the new USA subregional negotiation strategy, together with difficulties in the SPG-DRUGS (were reflected in the Guadalajara Declaration) where the EU does not abandon its multilateral option but reactivates the subregional way. On the one hand, the language includes a generic commitment to move forward in the WTO framework (point 66) although they omit major disagreements between both regions that came up at the Cancun Conference. On the other the Declaration includes a mutual commitment to reach a "balance and ambitious" agreement between the EU and MERCOSUR by October 2004 before the present mandate of the European commission expires next November (point 54).

However, this option was not proposed for the Andean and Central American countries. Compared to Madrid, the Guadalajara Declaration places more demands on these two

---

<sup>8</sup> The political dialog and cooperation agreements signed in December 2003 between the EU and the Andean Community and with the Central American countries do not include the trade component (free trade zone) between the parties, and therefore they are not similar to the association agreement signed with Mexico and Chile, and the agreement under negotiation with MERCOSUR. When they were signed, the agreements with CAN and the Central American countries were announced as a step to or the basis for negotiations of association agreements with EU.

groups of countries as it includes two prior conditions for beginning the negotiations (point 53). As was already known, these negotiations are subject to the conclusion of the "Doha Round" but—as a new element—they should start from a "sufficient level" of regional economic integration. Determining whether that level has been reached, a "joint assessment" of integration will be conducted so that it will "in time" open the ground for negotiations.<sup>9</sup>

- **Civil society involvement** was not given necessary recognition in the Declaration, nor in the contributions leading to the Summit; nor was its role in strengthening birregional relationships recognized. This matter is addressed with a short announcement to "*continue promoting dialog and consultation with civil society as part of the birregional association processes and providing timely access to information for citizens*" (point 100). It should be noted that the Declaration does not use the word "*participation*" nor does it mention the role of Civil Society in social cohesion; Civil Society is not included as an actor to be concerning cooperation for development. Regular dialogue between parliamentarians, local and regional authorities, business communities and organized Civil Society is seen barely as an instrument to "*strengthen*" the birregional strategic association (point 102).

#### **IV. Conclusion**

After this review and comparing the proposals made by the various civil society meetings before the Summit and the results of Sanahuja's analysis of the final Declaration, no analyst can ignore the gap between the ambitious recommendations proposed by the LAC-EU civil society and the Guadalajara Summit. However, aware of the limitations inherent to these participatory exercises, civil society organizations should recognize in this debate and IN lobbying an instrument they need to use and improve upon, as well as the type of international initiatives that should be fostered, broadened and enriched, not only to strengthen civil society and social Euro-Latin American alliances, but also strengthen and develop birregional strategic association that will create greater official goodwill.

We are persuaded a strategic alliance can be built not only based on the Summit but also on initiatives and proposals from a wide range of community sectors. To do so, we must insist on the need to ensure the involvement of organized civil society from LAC and EU in various regional fora and in particular in the Summits themselves, even if for now they may remain almost inaccessible.

In this respect, if Euro-Latin American-Caribbean civil society wishes to gain a stronger presence in the dynamics of birregional relationships, it must continue to develop an

---

<sup>9</sup> This demand was already included in the European Commission Communication before the Summit. Drafted using an unusually critical language towards Latin American integration processes, it describes an obvious fact. The present state of the Andean community (CAN) or SICA do not guarantee the free circulation of goods and services, and therefore it is possible to negotiate free trade with the EU. However, this demand also exposes the Commission's frustration as it has funded the strengthening of regional institutions and the organization of customs units, pursuant to agreements in each group, and yet it finds itself powerless to counter systematic failure to honour the integration commitments and schedules adopted by both blocs of nations.

strengthen relationships that will give it a greater influence on governments, while drafting an agenda for such influence, including—among other elements—a number of short and medium term initiatives, such as:

- a) A map or inventory of existing institutional fora for a dialog and consultation by civil society from both regions, at the level of present and future agreements between EU and LAC countries and regions; at country level and within the various institutional instances (European Commission, Joint Commissions, Committees, etc.).
- b) A systematisation of influence initiatives developed so far (for instance, since 1999, when the EU-LAC strategic association project was launched), gathering information about the involved players, initiatives, results, etc.
- c) Linking follow up of the recent Summit and other decisions to initiatives for implementation monitoring, in particular those that may eventually involve civil society to make them effective and, if appropriate, contribute to materialize them. For instance:

- Although the EUROsociAL program launched in Guadalajara to promote social cohesion in LAC countries principally aims at providing government officials' training, its language does not rule out, therefore opens up the possibility of, involving civil society in some of its activities (e.g. seminars). Nothing will be done at the official level to promote this involvement. Consequently, we require a follow up strategy focussing on program implementation awards so that this option may become a reality.

- The recent award by the European Commission of the EU-LA Relations Observatory implies that soon a number of academic organizations from both continents will start carrying out activities, studies, draft proposals, etc. concerning the future of these relationships. Given this fact, it is indispensable for civil society to build communication bridges with those academic organizations whose proposals will certainly have an impact on future official decisions. Undoubtedly, some actors (such as the EESC) will be directly linked to the Observatory but we may wonder about the condition of all other organizations, including NGOs that are not included in that organization or their Latin American sisters.

- d) Actively participating in a number of initiatives for dialogue with civil society included in existing or future agreements between the EU and Latin American countries and regions, dialogue with civil society from EU and MERCOSUR about the future association agreement, planned by the general trade directorate under the European Commission for end-September this year.

- II Forum for dialog with civil society in the framework of the Global Mexico-EU Agreement planned in Mexico in the last quarter of 2004.

- Dialog with Civil Society planned in the framework of the association agreement between EU and Chile, not yet determined.

- To promote and support Civil Society participation in debates on future association agreements between EU and the Andean Community of nations and Central American countries. Negotiations are planned to begin next year so the necessary Civil Society proposals from each of these regions may be prepared in advance.
- e) Consider and try to influence a number of processes and decision making instances at the intermediate level, which will impact the development of EU-LAC relations. For instance, Among other issues that should be taken into account as a lightly scenario and target for incidence initiatives, the following should be considered:
- A debate at the level of European organizations of the financial perspectives for 2007-2013, with implications on resource allocation for cooperation with Latin America. This debate is linked to the possibility of allocating resources to the birregional "Solidarity Fund" created by the European Parliament to support cooperation with Latin America, but which is not funded in the current EU budget.
  - A review by the European Commission, Parliament and Counsel of the regulations for cooperation with Asian and Latin American countries (ALA Regulations).
  - Drafting of the new Regional Strategy for Latin America (2007-2010) to be prepared by the Commission and approved by the European Council before the IV LAC-EU Summit scheduled in Vienna (Austria) in May 2004.
  - Drafting the new Country Strategic Papers for Latin American countries next year. CSPs are internal European Commission Papers that lay the foundations for the Multiannual Cooperation Plans with each country those benefits from assistants. The Commission has planned to involve Civil Society from the assistance beneficiary nations in the drafting but each Commission delegation is free to implement this policy recommendation as it deems fit. A coordinated initiative between European and Latin America Civil Society is required to materialize this participation so that CSPs will include their vision in setting cooperation priorities.

These are but some of the issues that could be targeted by immediate European-Latin American Civil Society's attention and initiatives. If it wishes to have an impact on the direction of birregional relationships. This approach does not rule out but other reveals the need for efforts to create an explicit and shared strategy among social organizations from Latin America and Europe concerning the future we want for our birregional Strategic Association.

## Bibliografy and References

ACEVES RAMÍREZ, Ramón: "La sociedad civil rumbo a Guadalajara", en La Otra Cara de México, N° 85, DECA-Equipo Pueblo, México, marzo-abril 2004, pp. 6 – 7.

ALOP – Observatorio Social de las Relaciones Unión Europea – América Latina, N° 7, Bruselas, agosto 2004.

[www.alop.or.cr/trabajo/nuestro\\_proyectos/union\\_europa/observatorio/Boletin%20Observatorio\\_7.pdf](http://www.alop.or.cr/trabajo/nuestro_proyectos/union_europa/observatorio/Boletin%20Observatorio_7.pdf)

BALBIS, Jorge: "Cohesión social sin sociedad civil?", en CELARE: **Aportes a la III Cumbre Unión Europea, América Latina y el Caribe**, CELARE, Santiago de Chile, marzo 2004, pp. 109 – 123.

BECERRA POZOS, Laura: "Los alcances de la III Cumbre en Guadalajara", en La Otra Cara de México, N° 86, DECA-Equipo Pueblo, México, mayo-junio 2004, pp. 2 – 3.

SANAHUJA, José Antonio: "La Cumbre de Guadalajara: consensos y divergencias en las relaciones Unión Europea-América Latina y el Caribe", próxima publicación en Quórum, Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, Setiembre 2004.

III Cumbre América Latina y el Caribe – Unión Europea, Guadalajara, México, Mayo – 2004: **Declaración de Guadalajara.**

[www.alcuc.org/alcuc/web/doctos/Declaracion\\_Final\\_REESTRUCTURADA.pdf](http://www.alcuc.org/alcuc/web/doctos/Declaracion_Final_REESTRUCTURADA.pdf)

II Foro Euro-Latinoamericana-Caribeño de la Sociedad Civil – "Por una Asociación Unión Europea-América Latina y el Caribe que promueva la cohesión económica con justicia social y equidad", Pátzcuaro, Michoacán, México 24-26 de marzo, 2004: **Declaración ante la III Cumbre de Jefes de Estado y de Gobierno de la Unión Europea, América Latina y el Caribe.**

[www.alop.or.cr/trabajo/nuestro\\_proyectos/union\\_europa/foros/](http://www.alop.or.cr/trabajo/nuestro_proyectos/union_europa/foros/)

III Encuentro de la Sociedad Civil Organizada Unión Europea-América Latina y el Caribe, México, 13-15 de abril de 2004: **Declaración Final.**

[www.esc.eu.int/sections/rex/mexico/docs/Declaracion\\_actualizada\\_es.pdf](http://www.esc.eu.int/sections/rex/mexico/docs/Declaracion_actualizada_es.pdf)

CIOSL-CMT-CES-ORIT-CLAT - IIa. Cumbre Sindical Unión Europea – América latina y Caribe (UE/ALC), Ciudad de México, 16 de abril de 2004: **Declaración Final.**

[www.nuevasoc.org.ve/upload/anexos/foro\\_215.doc](http://www.nuevasoc.org.ve/upload/anexos/foro_215.doc)

## Annex I

**Proposed agenda for the III Summit of Latin American governments (through their representations in Brussels)**  
**Plenary LAC-GTAH Committee**  
**Social cohesion**  
**Drafting team 23.07.2003**

TOPICS	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
<b>Political dialogue</b>	
International Peace and Security	Reaching a more equitable and fair international system Consensus building to address global issues: drug trafficking, terrorism and organized international crime
Democratic governance (mutual dependence between democracy, economic and social development, effects on social cohesion and governance)	Dialogue on structural political Reform Strengthen of democracy, institutions and the rule of law
Struggle against poverty	Promotion of economic development and job creation
Migration	Harmonization (controls and regulations) of migration flows between both regions
<b>Economic framework</b>	
<b>A) Birregional</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Liberalization</li> </ul>	Ensuring greater market access and promoting LAC exports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Subregional integration</li> </ul>	Deepening subregional integration process
<b>B) Global</b>	
Foreign debt	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International financial architecture</li> </ul>	Crises prevention
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multilateral trade system</li> <li>▪ New financial mechanisms to strengthen democracy</li> </ul>	
<b>Cooperation</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research, science, technology</li> </ul>	Closing the existing gap between both regions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Education and culture</li> </ul>	Building human capital to defeat poverty