

“E PLURIBUS UNUM”
TESTING THE SPILLOVER CONCEPT IN AMERICA
IN SEARCH OF A WORLD WORKING PEACE SYSTEM

Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy Capstone Project

Submitted by RUBEN DARIO USECHE CARDENAS

July 31, 2013

© 2013 RUBEN DARIO USECHE CARDENAS

<http://fletcher.tufts.edu>



THE FLETCHER SCHOOL

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

AMDG

DEVOTION

To God

To my beloved wife, María Teresa, and

Our gifts from heaven:

Andrea, Sebastián and Mateo

You are my inspiration!

To my parents, Ruben Alberto and Carmen Rosa

To my family, and friends.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the Holy Trinity, the supreme example of Unity: Three different persons in only one God. I discovered an incredible monument to The Holy Trinity in Budapest, Hungary during our mid-year residency in August 2011. I felt so blessed for having visited such a wonderful European country, inspired by King Saint Stephen and his son, Prince Saint Emeric, whose name is the linguistic root of our continent, the land of Columbus. To the Virgin Mary, mother of God and ours. With her words “*Do whatever he tells you*” (John 2: 1-5) I am more than devoted to the following of Jesus, and in helping to find means that unite our human family with love, service, peace and justice, respecting our diversity.

To my beloved wife María Teresa, who received me in her native country (Ecuador) and rescued me from mine (Colombia). I will always love you. You are more than great. I am so proud of our children: Andrea Carolina, Sebastián Andrés and Mateo Julián, those precious children inspired me to be more than great. Our family shares the incredible condition of being part of more than one nation, learning how to appreciate and respect different cultures and how to be functional, as the basement for our society, devoted to help others always. Thank you for your patience, love, and strong support during this expedition into the deepest roots of my existence.

To my parents: Rubén Alberto and Carmen Rosa. If it had not been for your decision to move from Colombia to Ecuador, I would not have had the opportunity to find my vocation in this life, to do my best in defending family as the base of virtue, discovering ways that unite us, instead of those that divide us. To my brothers and sisters, my nieces and nephews. To all my friends, supporters, and those who I have in a special place in my heart, even those that passed away on to a better life, in particular my Father in Law, Luis Alfredo (R.I.P.) As Abraham Lincoln once said: “America is the last best hope on earth”. From the North to the South, this is our Promise Land. May God bless our World!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	6
II. BRIEF BACKGROUND	10
<i>America: The New Europe, “the whole is greater than the sum of the parts”</i>	
<i>A review from the OAS, UNASUR and The Pacific Alliance</i>	
III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
Theories of EU integration	
3.1 Federalism	
3.2. Intergovernmentalism	
3.3. Functionalism and Neofunctionalism	
IV. ANALYSIS	20
All politics is local (O’Neill)	
Integration and the Spill over concept	
The functional approach	
Latin America, the new laboratory for Neo-functionalists	
V. CONCLUSION	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	39
ENDNOTES	40

QUOTATIONS

“It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible”ⁱ

George Washington

“Neither individual nor state can do right actions without virtue and wisdom”ⁱⁱ

Aristotle

“All the good of the world and of Christianity, depends on the good education of the youth”ⁱⁱⁱ

Letter from St. Ignatius of Loyola to King Philip II of Spain

“The problems of the world cannot possibly be solved by skeptics or cynics, whose horizons are limited by the obvious realities. We need men who can dream of things that never were, and ask why not.”^{iv}

John F. Kennedy

“More than anyone, I desire to see America fashioned into the greatest nation in the world, greatest not so much by virtue of her area and wealth as by her freedom and glory.”

Fragments of the “Jamaica Letter”, by Simon Bolivar^v

I. INTRODUCTION

The previous quotes allow me to introduce the main goal of my research: Awake the ideal of integration in the “New World”, our home: **AMERICA**^{vi}, as well as the claim for One World united in peace and justice. In the early years of independence, the United States of America (former British colonies) followed the ideal “*e pluribus unum*” (from many, one)^{vii} to create and develop the strongest nation-state and market economy in the world, based on three pillars: Freedom, equality and the pursuit of happiness. This land of immigrants should return to them, in order to find the answers of our current challenges. On the other hand, Hispanic American colonies^{viii} followed the opposite ideal “*ex uno plura*” (from one, many). As a result it is a region divided among many states, which still believe in what have been called the “*Patria Grande*” (*Greater mother land*), as a goal to reach an ever-closer union of Latin America and the Caribbean (including the Portuguese colonies, now Brazil) but excluding the North of our continent. However, the term should be expanding it to include all the members of this region, from Canada to Argentina, in terms of opening doors to the rest of our world. I see this region as a Promise Land, because my family and cultural background formed me inside Christianity and devotion to God^{ix}. Disregarding our religious differences, here in America we all share democratic and cultural roots that came to us mainly from Europe, but also from other regions of the world. We speak four main languages (French, English, Spanish, Portuguese as well as Amerindian languages), and we share a territory full of natural resources, as well as great human resources that throughout history have contributed to the developing of our world. America is a land in which we can coexist with people from all over the world. From China, Japan, Russia, Europe, Africa, etc.

The ideal of American integration remains valid, disregarding the lack of success they had. Using this perspective I see the process of integration as a single and overarching one made of trial and error. Despite the fact that Latin America and the USA are moving in different trends of integration, we cannot

take for granted that in the medium or long term The Americas could be seen as a whole continent, integrated in a new super structure of Nations that share the same values, and respects the differences between its members. In that case, initiatives such as the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA), the OAS, The Pacific Alliance, Aladi, Unasur, the Andean Community or Mercosur, among others may be seen as the first seeds of such process, even though some of those initiatives alone, may be considered failed or dysfunctional ones. The history of the EU shows the same path, different communities and attempts of integration, that later merge onto one big process. Asean and the African Union are in the same path. This is a petition to change the way in which we look international relations, where integration is the way to live in peace in our planet, and where all those experiments of integration could be just parts of a greater overarching one: *our World*.

Even though the integration of the Americas is a difficult path, we still could think of it as a tendency for the consolidation of America as one single region. Moreover when the Hispanic or Latino population of the USA is growing^x and they are marking a new wave of intercultural traditions inside the USA. This is creating a *de facto integration* between both parts of our continent, as well as with people from other parts of the world. This should be a great opportunity to develop bridges between all cultures in our world and keep them together in peace, living in the same world, but located in different regions. Each culture has things to share with each other, and it could be a positive example if we overcome our differences. All immigrants who live in the USA came from all over the world in search of the American Dream. This fact, opened the gate to see *integration de facto* as a good case study for future research in social sciences, like sociology or psychology.

From this perspective, the current initiatives of integration that occur throughout the region, in particular the Latin American ones, could be seen as a global process involving single initiatives. In this thesis I consider regional and sub-regional experiences as OAS, UNASUR, and TPA, among others, as

pieces of a big map of integration of one region: The Americas^{xi}, our “*last best hope*”^{xii}. Nevertheless I will focus my attention in two examples, Unasur and The Pacific Alliance, and the way in which those experiences will open the opportunity to connect the North and the South to regenerate the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Pan-Americanism, as well as the East and the West with nations from other parts of our world. The total population of The Americas is nearly 930 millions^{xiii}, a number that could have a positive and great impact in our world if we take a look at it as a whole body, not as its parts separated by prisms that divides our common home. When we take into consideration that this region shares common religious and moral values that mandate us to see others as our neighbors, living in the same neighborhood, we could coexist with tolerance and respect others for their different points of view and traditions. In this way, America could be the same, North, South, West or East. We have the hard task to reintegrate our region to become a hope for the rest of the world. We pledge for a new Marshall Plan among us, in times of peace, and should not wait until war, natural disasters or external factors determine us to take actions to satisfy the common needs. Probably there will not be an opportunity for that, so we must act now, and not wait for tomorrow. Service is at hands and we must start doing something, before it is too late. Our world need us integrated, not segregated it.

One of the key questions, from the perspective of an “overarching process” of integration is to determine if LAC is going into a deeper process of integration. In other words, using a Neo-functionalist approach, the question could be: Is LAC pushing its states into a political integration involving a reduction of the sovereignty of them? Beyond failed experiences, is Latin America engaged in a political integration process? This perspective emphasize on an overarching process of integration, than in single initiatives. Moreover, there is one theoretical trend that contents that integration should be seen as a process fueled by what they call “spillover”. This theory is Neo-functionalism. I argue that this framework of analysis is an appropriate tool to understand what is happening in Latin America and in the

rest of the world, in terms of integration processes.

My research question is whether or not South America is entering a process of political integration. A second related inquiry is whether the different initiatives of integration in the region, could be seen as a process of “spillover” in The Americas. For this thesis I have developed the following testable hypothesis: - The greater the number of initiatives of integration in a region, the more opportunities to consolidate successful political integration. - With the case of Unasur, the Americas are currently experiencing the merging of different failed processes of integration as Mercosur and the ANC, which will force this region to test the neo-functionalist concept of “spillover”. To test my hypothesis I will do some analysis of the EU, and other theories of integration and their application to the integration process in LA. My study is centered on the process of integration in the Americas as being an overarching one. The information was collected through summaries from selected readings on the EU integration theories as well as sources about integration in the Americas. It has been collected through the research of libraries, personal archives, news from the Internet and web pages of institutions of integration of the Americas. It was also necessary to use secondary resources, anecdotic evidence and my previous formation at the School of Law in Colombia and Ecuador.

This research thesis is structured as follows: This introduction, followed by a second section that shows a brief background. The third one is a review of literature of the theories of integration that from my humble point of view we should have to take a look (Federalism, Intergovernmentalism and Functionalism). However, I will follow in this thesis the functional approach and the natural law school, when analyzing integration in the Americas, particular based on David Mitrany ideas and some others from Ernst Haas, but also comparing and extracting some ideas from others theories. The fourth part describes our understanding of the concepts of integration and spillover and its application to the regional and sub regional cases of integration. The fifth section provides the conclusion.

II. BRIEF BACKGROUND

Recent events have permitted Latin America to become a region to test integration theories, in particular when we take into consideration the new blocks of countries that have flourished in spite of their common problems. Such as Unasur with 361 million inhabitants, the Pacific Alliance with 207 million inhabitants or in a more optimistic way the OAS with 930 million inhabitants. Are they inspired by the rhetoric anti-Americanism and new socialism promoted during the last decade, by the deceased Venezuelan President Chavez, and their partners or sponsors in the region? Or are they inspired by historical traditions and loyalties to the Greater Mother Land (Patria Grande) of Miranda, Bolívar, San Martín or Del Valle? (There are also some Americans in the US and Canada that proclaimed and supported the idea of Pan Americanism) Another important question to solve is: Whether or not Brazil is trying to use this integration process to control and increase its leadership in the world, and the region? Or are those different integration processes, pieces of an overarching Pan American union? Are those experiments a new battle of ideas between liberal markets *versus* controlled or central planned economies? To solve some of these questions, we need to test our creative thinking on how to connect those initiatives with our partners in all of The Americas. Those events could be summarized as follows:

Unasur treaty signed on May 2008 came into being in 2011 and created a “*space for integration and union among its peoples in the cultural, social, economic and political fields*” (Article 2, *Unasur Treaty*). This initiative started with the former Brazilian President Fernando Cardoso, during the first meeting of Presidents of South American Nations that took part in Brasilia in the year 2000^{xiv}. With Unasur, the region became a new laboratory of integration that goes beyond the convergence of previous experiences as Mercosur and the Andean Community (ANC), expanding the goals to a closer geographical political union that include all the countries of South America, excluding the French Guiana^{xv} and the Falkland islands. This experiment classifies South America as a geographic region, with

similar values and historical ties. It excludes those members that are not part of it, following the same division that some scholars started to use in the XIX century as a Latino American culture in opposition to an Anglo-Saxon America^{xvi}. With Unasur the division is geographical. North, Central and South America play different roles for the entire region as well as the rest of our world. However they opened the door for future Latin American integration processes that also include Mexico and other Latin American countries. Unasur members are convinced that *persistent poverty, exclusion and social inequality* in the region could be solved with integration and unity (Preamble of Unasur treaty). The official languages of Unasur are Portuguese, Spanish, English and Dutch. However, they forgot to include Amerindian languages as Quechua or Aymara, among others, that are spoken by millions of indigenous peoples in this area. If Brazil will lead the South American region, we need to enact the words of US Vice-President Joe Biden, who in his previous visit to Brazil said: *“We have different strengths -- Brazil and the United States -- and combined, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.”*^{xvii} Our challenge is to spread up Vice-President Biden’s words throughout the region, from Alaska to Chile and from Argentina to Canada.

A recent economic integration process started as the new promise in Latin America, The Pacific Alliance (TPA) with Colombia, Chile, Mexico, and Peru as clear representatives of the free trade and the connection with the Pacific region, or what it has been called the ‘New Brazil’^{xviii}, the most important requirement to become part of this experiment is to have free trade agreements between all members, strong roots in liberal ideas and the rule of law and clear promotion of democracy. It seems that this new experiment of economic integration will be a counter balance to Unasur, Celac and Alba initiatives, dividing the region in a group with access to the Pacific Ocean that probably will force the countries in Central America, to join the alliance (Panama and Costa Rica are prepared), Canada is an observer, and Ecuador is evaluating what it should do in the near future. As a block, the Pacific Alliance is one of the most open economies in the world.

Both integration experiments are opposite sides of the same equation. Their future will mark the path for Latin America and its members, in their relations with third parties, in particular with the USA and Canada. If Latin American countries find a way to overcome their differences and open opportunities for a convergence of all those integration processes as they proscribed in the ALADI treaty (Cuba is part of it, Panama became a member in 2009, and Nicaragua applied in 2012), Latin American integration could represent a market economy of 582 million people. If we add the US and Canada, our market economy in the entire region will be that of nearly 930 million people with a vast territory in which we could share our resources, with others from the region, and from abroad. This could open the gate to world integration. We should open our minds and see that European countries have overseas territories in this land, and they should not be for battles of power, but for satisfactions of needs of all inhabitants. Only then, UNASUR will replace the territorial and constitutional approach for a functional one where service is at hands, and nobody is excluded.

As pointed out by Admiral James G. Stavridis (our new Fletcher Dean), *“To survive in the 21st-century environment, an organization needs each member to be a sensor: no one of us is as smart as all of us together. The entire organization has to exist as a living, breathing, adapting, fluid, and evolving organism”*. (Stavridis, Page: 27) and we have to face common problems as *poverty and inequality, public security, human mobility, and energy security*^{xix} that will change our direction in this century. In his book “Partnership for the Americas”, Admiral Stavridis describes why the US – Latin American relations are so important for our future to come.

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theories of EU integration

Scholars see the EU integration process as an extraordinary case to study global governance and regionalism. It is a “laboratory”^{xxx} to test any theory of integration and international relations, and it would be a case to show if those theories that explains what is happening in Europe could tell us something about other integration experiences as the Pan-American one, the African Union or Asean.

Realists consider that anarchy, caused by the absence of superior power over the states, moves state decisions in terms of distrust and within the limits of Nation-States borders. They introduce concepts as the balance of power, where power is seen as the source that moves everything, so only power can create order. From a realist sense there is an approach of integration, called Intergovernmentalism, principally represented by Andrew Moravscik. However, there is another school of thought: The liberalists consider that peace, prosperity, and justice are possible between all people. This school of thought makes room for international and supranational organizations, as well as the idea of *One World* (claimed by David Mitrany). This is organized by a web of relations among its members throughout international cooperation and integration, where each nation is part of a superior whole. Only when each part of the human being will have satisfied their needs, then the causes of war will disappear. Functionalism, Neo-functionalism, as well as the Legal School of thought -with Aristotelian and St. Thomas Aquinas natural law- opens a prism so as to see the phenomena under different lenses. Neither the realists, nor the liberalists have the magic answer to each question.

3.1 Federalism

The federal ideology was part of the history of the modern state and politics. As pointed by Mitrany, “*federalism is one of the great inventions of political theory and life. It came to us from the New World –USA- and has been adopted in a number of places especially in newer political groupings*”

(Mitrany, Page. 351). The federal idea worked well in the creation of modern states, changing from colonialism to a new system of relations among the nations of our world, where each one was allowed to follow its own path to freedom and development. Under those premises, the fathers of European integration, as Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman or Winston Churchill laid the foundations of the EU based in a federal approach, as addressed by Churchill “*we must re-create the European Family in a regional structure called, it may be, the United States of Europe.*”^{xxi} They were creating a new regional political group, from the nation-state to a new structure of power in the international arena.

Contemporary theorists are looking to the EU as a new case to test the federalist approach, comparing both cases USA -first ‘national federation’- and the EU -new federal paradigm-. The EU motto is ‘United in diversity’, that is pretty close to the USA motto ‘E pluribus Unum’. After two world wars, Europe appeared to be the best scenario to test hypothesis that will answer those and more questions, concerning the preservation of peace and the balance in the world order. In opposition to the American case, where former colonies declare their *independence*, creating new nation-states, the EU is a case in which free nation-states declared their *interdependence*, after two world wars that devastated their region. We should learn from that experience to evade and prevent wars, and create the working peace system that Mitrany shared with us in the middle of that big crisis in Europe. The EU is creating a new structure of power, pooling sovereignty -exclusive of their member states- into a new center of power composed by supranational authorities. In the EU the federal idea was proposed as the end for its members, not the condition. Integration would get ‘*an ever closer union*’ in Europe, or what others have called ‘federalism by installments’ (Mitrany - Haas). But they claimed for World union.

So the Federal idea in the EU started to build the first blocks of a complex process that is moving “clearly” in a federal direction. As pointed by Burgess, “*there has, in short, been a complex interaction between economics and politics in the pursuit of national self-interest by the member states of the EU that*

has resulted in a new kind of federal union the like of which has never before seen” (Burgess, Page 27).

The federalist approach is important in the analysis of the research question that we are trying to answer in Latin America, and the way in which we can observe the foreign policies of some countries, as well as their devotion to integration. From regionalism to sub-regionalism in the Americas, the federal approach is necessary to understand why Latin American countries remained idealistic with the goal of the “Patria Grande”. To sum up, federalism is an ‘institutional arrangement in which: (a) public authority is divided between state governments and a central government; (b) each level of government has some issues on which it makes final decisions; and (c) a federal high court adjudicates disputes concerning federalism’ (R. Daniel Kelemen, 2003: 185, cited by Pollack, 2009: 28). All of them present in the system of supranational institutions and nation-states created by European countries, and present in an irregular form in the Latin American one.

3.2 Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI)

As marked by Moravcsik and Schimmelfennig, LI rests upon two basic assumptions about politics: *1. States are actors*; and, *2. States are rational*, so they had to rest upon their interests and capacity to negotiate in terms of cooperation, so integration is a way in which states uses their capacities to increase their scope of action. The same authors considered that EU integration is part of LI theory, because “*is not about replacing the nation-state, but about ‘rescuing’ and adapting it to cope with globalization*”. (Moravcsik, and Schimmelfennig, Pages 68 - 73)

The case of Agriculture is an example of the bargaining capacity of states inside the EU. De Gaulle’s threat to withdraw from the process or the so called ‘empty chair’ is one of the key examples of the power of states inside an integration process, which probes that there is not political power over the state. In the case of South America, the Andean Community (ANC) had experienced the same. When Venezuela withdrew from the process in 2006, or Chile in 1976, there was not capacity or forcibility over

the states, to keep them both inside the community, because each state have the possibility, and its right, to denounce the treaty, and stay apart from the block, that is the right of any nation, to be a member or not. The same happens in Europe with Norway or Switzerland, both are not members of the EU, but they have a vast amount of agreements between one to each other. In both cases, the supranational community could not prevent the withdrawal of one member, or force others to join the group. That is a voluntary therapy group, that each member has to follow when came onto that conclusion. This is a voluntary invitation to say yes or no. The same could happen with Paraguay in the Mercosur case, this country has a reaction against continuing in Mercosur, after the block suspension, when the coup d'état of former President Lugo took place. From this perspective, the EU or any other regional or sub-regional case, should be seen it as processes of ambitious multilateral organizations, but not as supranational ones. They are testing the power of states under the pressures of globalization and regionalism. Here is important to see the reaction of small states, powerful states or new states, because integration is testing every one of them, without exclusions.

3.3 Functionalism and Neo-Functionalism

This theory was proposed in the late 1940's by David Mitrany as a claim or anxiety for One World, not only for European integration, in the middle of the WWII. Later on this Ernst Haas and Leon Lindberg, re-launched the idea. As pointed by Niemann and Schmitter (2009) this theory "finds its intellectual antecedents at the juncture between functionalist, federalist and communication theories, while also drawing indirectly on the 'group theorist' of American politics. Both Haas and Lindberg "combined functionalist mechanism with federalist goals". "Neo-functionalists attached considerable importance to the autonomous influence of supranational institutions and the emerged role of organized interests". Both authors considered that this theory is "about the dynamics of European integration"; in this thesis we see this theory as the dynamics of World integration, not exclusively related to the

European model and it will be use it to test it in The Americas process of integration.

Haas in “The Uniting of Europe” set out a neo-functionalist theory of regional integration, that later became more elaborated by him and other scholars (Pollack P. 17) in which the central idea is the concept of “functional spill over” to explain how the initial integration process in two principal sectors (coal and steel) put pressure to extent that integration to other areas. As Pollack mentioned, “Neo-functionalist predicted, sectorial integration would produce the unintended and unforeseen consequence of promoting further integration in additional issue areas” (P. 18)

The functional approach relies in changing the variables that moves the international order and system, in where conflict is replaced by integration, and power by need. Here we have to be clear that the basement upon the analysis should be take it in terms of needs. What needs should be satisfied? Who will receive those benefits? And how we could move power away from the system, in order to have other variables that move each one of the member of this world to cooperate and work together for a better place to live in peace and harmony? As pointed by Haas, “*The truth is that by its very nature the constitutional approach -to world peace and unity- emphasizes the individual index of power; the functional approach emphasizes the common index of need*” shifting the emphasis from power to problem, purpose and task. (Haas, Pages 6-7)

After pointing out that in all societies there are harmonies and disharmonies, and that the latter exist because “conflict prevail in a society in which authority is exercised by politicians rather than technicians, by parliaments rather than voluntary groups.” Haas mentioned that “Power instead of the common good, then determines policy, and irrational behavior follows”. “Preaching the administration and construction of the common good is itself part of the therapy for a disharmonious society” (Haas, Page 9) Integration blocks became schools of learning, like those voluntary groups that help others to find the answers to the same solutions.

From this perspective, in order to achieve the maximum goal, to have a world society in harmony, loyalties should be moved by phases, from states to humanity. That means, that all human beings are members of the same human family, because only in that way we are able to achieve the true common good. But humanity needs organizations, and that only can be achieved by voluntary groups (not by the imposition of ideas using force), those groups are created by free nation-states, composed by free individual persons, that have common principles and that inspired others to join a more closer union among its members, in which states interact with each other for the same benefits of its members. When facing common problems, the more members searching for the same goals, the better opportunities to have great solutions. As pointed by Stavridis, “form follows function, but form matters” and we should look for good voluntary groups, those that open gates to others, and not those that closes doors and separate our common destiny.

After criticized that the unnatural state took the place of natural society, Haas goes deeper in trying to remove causes of war and international insecurity, where conflict exists because there exist territorial principles based on power, instead of functional principles where national problems are just the “local segments of general problems”.

Haas introduce the concept of “Federalism by installments”, where international voluntary groups, become a species of group therapy to learn how to face the same problems but with different approaches. Here, again, we are changing the variables that moves our societies, “service rather than social conflict then is the natural condition of man”. (Haas, Page 20) As a way to introduce a moral component, Haas proposed that *integration –rather than conflict- would be the central pillar of the future structure of international relations.*

From this perspective, Hass proposed the separation of those voluntary groups, from power to welfare, Military-defense (power based) vs. Economic-abundance (welfare based) or political unions

(power based) vs. technical ones (welfare based). Only when we had achieved the common good, or the welfare of all the members of our society, is only when we could talk about a political community. Mitrany defines political community as the sum of the functions carried out by its members.

If we want to use Functionalism as an analytical tool for the study of international organization we cannot sidestep the definition of integration. It is a process, a condition or both? Some authors define it as a “Process that links a given concrete international system with a dimly discernible future concrete system” expert- politician, state – society- This in turn, requires the insertion into Functionalist thought of a more highly structured theory of law than is now present (page 30) The Functional theory of law express that the task must be the creation of a world moral order, elevating the aspirations of the individual human being at the expense of the state and its sovereignty. Thus C. Wilfred Jenks. UN specialized agencies and their work as the source of a new kind of law. The common law of mankind and the wellbeing of individuals. Some people at the UN agencies are talking about the “New York consensus” as a new path to the world. All of these are related with Aquinas definition of Law, and from this point of view, a real functional law should be the natural law of nations.

To sum up, an integrated system is a successful system where each member have satisfied its needs, and where no one is ‘making ends meet’ to survive in this planet. The issue is to keep balance in a functional way, where all the three kind of goods of humanity are satisfied in the Aristotelian way. Integration moves our current system toward a more universal type of system, or a “natural end” in the Aristotelian sense, that is our pledge from all the cardinal points on Earth (Haas, Pages 60, 79)

IV. ANALYSIS

“All Politics is Local” (Tip O’Neill)

Yet, historically, this region has pursued this dream of integration (older than Europe). It started as early as the XIX century with the Pan-Americanism with great examples as the Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO), the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) or the Organization of American States (OAS) founded on the roots of the father of integration, Simon Bolivar. Later on this, this idea spilled over during the second half of the XX century in a sub regional way (Latin American, Central American, South American, Andean region, Mesoamerican, Iberoamerican, Amazonic region, etc.). Since all those experiences covered different aspects of integration (economic, social, cultural, security and/or political integration) the dream seems to remain alive, at least at some level. Looking at those different initiatives as part of one overarching “process” –the process of integration– explicitly shows how active American states (in particular the Hispanic ones) have been in pursuing the ideal of integration in a region of peace^{xxii}. Some international scholars in the international law started talking about an independent international law, which was called American international Law, inspired by the school of thought of Fray Francisco de Vitoria or Fray Bartholomew de Las Casas. It was a tradition in some Latin American schools of law to study this field as a different and more focused class of international law, extremely close to Saint Thomas Aquinas natural law explanation, about the origin of the law.^{xxiii}

Integration is a topic that remains extremely relevant, regardless of the failure or success of a given initiative. Regionalism allows the conformation of blocks of countries, like big parts of the same puzzle that will rebuild our world. But it also allows small states, as Hispanic American ones, to improve their relative weight and position in the international political and economic arena. Moreover, American integration could be seen from the realist mind set as a counterweight for other powerful countries and/or block of countries as China, Russia or Europe, but from a *Christian functional approach* it is a clear

invitation to become more integrated in a world of international webs that allow each one of us to be fully realized and satisfied in our needs as members of the same family living in a shared world^{xxiv}. This is not a threat, is an invitation to build together an integrated system that could help each nation and individual in this world to satisfy his or her needs.

Policies of free market economy (where there is a fair place for everyone, and not a savage capitalism for a few), security policies of a region protected by two great oceans, and where democratic principles prevail, could coexist if we organized the region in a more complex system of international relations where sub regional experiences will force enlargement of integration not only of the region, but open to other parts of our world. However it is necessary to respect the individuality of each nation as part of this process. It is not to replace the nation-state, it is to reinforce it and connect it into a greater system of international organizations, as well as empowering the decentralization of municipalities, counties, provinces, towns, and small communities, to stay bound by the same whole.

Each one of them has something to say, and we should listen to them. If we evade the claim of those subgroups inside any society, division will exist, and later they will have to create their own new nation or sometimes an illegal armed group, because power is so centralized and because our differences move us to build walls, instead of seeing our common things to build bridges that unite us. We should learn from the USA experience in the federal system, and replicate it into the international arena to keep all parts unified as a whole. It cost civil wars, but times has changed and it is wise to learn from others, and the USA internal experiences could help a lot to the rest of the world. Each part has to do what it must has to do for the benefits of the whole, but we need to understand that each part have different resources, capabilities and loyalties, we just have to find what reasons unite us to work together. The logical one is justice, peace and service to all, but not with extremist's loyalties.

Tip O'Neill mentioned that "all Politics is local", and we should learn that each city, each group,

each family, have a different story of success or failure, a different need, a different end, but they all have the same right to pursuit happiness as free men and women, we should listen to them. A new international system may allow other political entities, as those of the cities to interact with others in a globalized world. The respect for the rule of law, the priority of liberty and the promotion of equal opportunities to all members in the pursuing of happiness should be the premise in which we have to build our common good. There is an American dream, but we have to re-think on it, as a way to satisfy our own needs in base of our differences and the free will. From here we can expand the wealth and good to the entire world. Just then, not only America, but also the entire world, will be our promise land, and the region of opportunities to every one, as well as our families, satisfying their needs in a functional way to enjoy all the goods that are available for every one. We should take a look of this new international system that takes care of each one of its members, not only majority or minority, but all. From the small town to the great region we should take care of our needs. This is why all politics is local, in terms of O'Neill, and each technocrat or authority has to represent his local community. As mentioned in some lectures and readings in the GMAP program, we should think globally but act locally.

Integration and the Spillover concept

Our language is the first cultural expression of what we perceive from the external world and the principal mean in which we express our feelings, emotions, ideas and dreams. Learning another language is a way to appreciate and respect other cultures^{xxv} and it is also a way to interconnect different nations, creating bridges that unite us, instead of walls that divide us. Here in America we speak four main European languages: English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese. But we also speak other Amerindian languages, like Quechua or Aymara in the Andean region. It will be great that some day we can learn, share and respect those main languages, to better understand what other Americans have to say in this Promise Land^{xxvi} that we share as our home.

If we have so many languages in America, what could it be said for the rest of our world? There are so many languages in our world, as well as cultures, interests and religions. If it is sometimes difficult to understand and comprehend others in our same language, how difficult is to understand different languages, religions and cultures. But each human being in this world understands one language: Love and Justice, so service is the unique way in which we can do the task for a supreme well-being, where everyone are sisters and brothers^{xxvii}, Not everyone has the opportunity and blessing of learning other languages, and live inside other culture or interact peacefully with different faiths. That is the peace that God want for each one of us.^{xxviii} For that reason in this research I follow the natural meanings of words and our roots in Latin or Greek, trying to find ideas, principles, values and virtues in common, to build bridges between the North and the South, the West and the East of this wonderful and unique world, but keeping our differences and spaces.

Integration -as opposed to segregation- came from the Latin root *Integratio – onis* that means “action or effect of integrate or being integrated” and integrate means “the act of combining or adding parts to make a unified whole”, or “to complete a whole with the parts that were lost”^{xxix}. From this semantic point of view, we can say that integration is an action that creates a “unified whole”. From a Christian point of view God made that action yet,^{xxx} so we as creatures just have to keep natural things in its way. We are one world, divided by geographic regions, but each part has its own resources, some more than others, so we must start building a system that connect each part to receive the goods to function and play the role in the system. In international relations that unified whole could be the “World Union”, in a utopian way of thinking. From this perspective, that unified whole could be at first level a Functional World System in which nation-states, could be the pieces that moves the system through supranational agencies, as well as through their own local or national administrations. The same as our body has different parts, but is still one body, our world is only one. Free will is the only thing that each one of us

has as natural right, and nobody can force other to do something against its will. God created us with differences and send to different regions for some Divine reason, so we all have different functions and gifts that we should share with others for the wealth of all human beings. We need all the parts to be considered one world. If one part of our world suffers, all others will suffer.^{xxxii} But the same as some persons have different capacities, there are others who have different disabilities and each society have to build opportunities to reintegrate them to be a functional human system. One example of this is Haiti in Latin America, I believe that a functional international system will allow that country to develop the inner strengths to stand up upon its feet and develop their society as others in the region.

Words as integrating, uniting or completing, involves actions of forgiving, loving and overcoming differences, leaving the past in the past, and start building our future with the voices of all members of our entire “human family”^{xxxii}, in particular those whose voices have had a great impact throughout human history, respecting values and principles shared by all human beings. From the beginning of our history, there are so many great ideas that transcend among the years. From Aristotle to Aquinas, from Grotius to Francisco de Vitoria, the natural law implies that any human being has the ability to discover truth, and reclaim one important gift: Virtue. *“It was Aristotle’s belief that virtue and human happiness are synonymous.... Both Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas also believed that at the pinnacle of moral life are the virtues of love and justice, which transcended mere adherence to rules and laws.”* (Bradshaw, John, Page 31) Those inner strengths were clear to the fathers of our nations, as James Madison -cited by Bradshaw- pointed: *“Is there no virtue among us? If there be not ... no form of government will secure liberty and happiness without any form of virtue in the people, is a chimerical idea.”* (Bradshaw, Page 33)

From my humble point of view, the process of political integration of our human family started with the US Declaration of Independence, on July 4th of 1776, and those men who signed it, were virtuous men and visionaries that proclaimed the USA to God. That declaration was spread among the nations, and

inspired not only the French declaration, but also others in Latin America. We all are members of one world in which we have to keep unity inside diversity, and if we could see America as a geographic region where we can complete our unity, the other nations on earth will follow our step. Europe, Asia and Africa are trying to build their own integration processes, but those regions had experienced more violent crisis and wars than ours, however the challenges of our times do not prevent us from the nightmares of war, so we have to work hard to preserve peace region by region, and hope some day to have peace in the whole world. What could it happen if Bolivar and Washington had met together? We cannot return back in time to the past, but we should remember that those fathers of our independencies have a lot of ideas in common. So we should based upon them to start thinking in a new path for this XXI century. Bolivar wore Washington pins in his battles in South America. Bolivar went to Boston, and Washington and visit Mount Vermont, so American ideas came into his mind, but it was not the time for them to build the American union. Nowadays it should be great to have the dream that some day in our history the emblematic birds of our continent could fly together, so the American Eagle and the Andean Condor will share the sky of a continent that is integrated by the pillars of the fathers of our nations from the XIX century.

However, there is no better way to express what we have inside, than acts of peace and love, but sometimes our egoism, envy and human weaknesses distract our attention to those things that divide us, instead of focusing our energy to pursuit that common good^{xxxiii} that unite us. You could give thousands of words, but you will express better your ideas an emotions with acts. That is the reason for this research work to call everyone here in this region to work hard on those things that we share and respect in common, trying to pursuit our happiness as an American nation.

From the ancient Greeks to our modern world, the phrase "Strength in Unity" will always call our attention. Any social revolution relies upon this principle, and the fathers of our modern states, in

particular those from the USA; follow the ideal E Pluribus Unum. As a land build by immigrants and the most desired placed for living in the world^{xxxiv}, the USA is the nation among the nations that better reflects the ideal and utopia of Union, and the federal way to keep those checks and balances to preserve united a Nation of immigrants for more than 200 years that still is the greater power of our world. But this great power is in the middle of the worst crisis in history, and it is important to remember that in Chinese characters, crisis has two meanings (problem, as well as opportunity). We should stand on the latter meaning to start building together a new America from the North to the South of our continent.

When I started questioning myself about integration in my previous studies of International Law, I was only focusing to the dream of political integration of a particular sub region in our world: The Andean Region and Latin America. By that time I was segregating Canada and the USA. Within this research job, I started questioning myself about the new waves of integration in South America and Latin America as cases of eventually political integration. But in my mind is still a new anxiety, to connect the North and the South of our continent, because we still have many differences that divide us and we have to be connectors to get the best from both worlds and share it with the rest of the world. For future discussions, it should be interesting to test the spillover concept among the different process of integration around the world and try to find bridges that connect them.

It is important at this point to clarify the definition of integration based on the previous analysis, it should not be considered as an end or goal, but as a "process"^{xxxv} because is a human action, perfectible and it is always in travail, as any society is. So it should mean that it has different stages in which many aspects merge. In that sense we have to return to the pillars that created the nation-states and there we find an incredible basement. When the fathers of the US nation wrote the declaration of independence and the US Constitution, they all rely on one book that is still a great resource to all of those who wants to explore the natural law inspiration. In the "Law of Nations" Monsieur de Chavellier described a deep study of

natural roots of individuals and translated it into the world of nations. *Ius gentium* as oppose to civil law in ancient Rome, was the root of modern international law, and if we add the American International law, we could find that anxiety that David Mitrany pointed for a functional approach, and the claim for a “federalism by instalments”. That will take place some day of our history (this is a pledge for this to happen, before it is too late). Each nation should be considered as individuals inside an international system, but they need others to survive. We are not Robinson Crusoe’s living in solitude in the middle of an island, without interaction with other humans beings. We all are members of a greater island called America, as well as members of one planet located in a small part of the universe in which we must work hard to satisfy the needs of each one of us, teaching how to fish, instead of providing the fish. However, in a time when others are dying for not having nothing to eat, it is necessary to put the building blocks to provide the basic human needs, and prepare different leaders to train others to fulfill their own needs by themselves.

Integration is a process in which those states and non-state actors are trying to move “their loyalties, expectations and political activities toward a new centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states. The end result of a process of political integration is a new political community superimposed over the pre-existing ones” (Haas definition of integration, cited by Niemann and Schmitter, 2009) This definition is not as cautious as Lindberg’s, whose ideas refer to “expectations and political activities to a new centre”, and do not involve loyalties. However in my analysis I see that this is a matter of different level of loyalties, not only national ones, but regional ones and world’s also, that will create the functional system that create the political community that satisfies the needs of each member. If we see cases as the UN peace missions, they all shared the same values and principles and their loyalties are transferred to a world mission. In the case of Unasur, we had experienced a new sentiment of belonging to a region that was forgotten for several years. But whose needs we need

to satisfy? And what kind of needs we should attend?

Here the concept of spillover, let us comprehend what had happened in the EU, in which an integration process of one sector, force the different actors to expand the options for other treatments and agreements to expand the goal. In Haas terms, “the integration of one sector leads to a technical pressure pushing states to integrate other sectors” (Niemann and Schmitter: Page 49). From the coal and steel, or the atomic field, the EU went on to a deeper process of integration that involves trade, commerce, monetary union, security and foreign policy and is moving in a clear way into a federal IO or a post modern state. It is now in crisis, but that is just another phase to test what is going on in terms of integration in this laboratory.

Groups from the private sector also moves the integration process, and that is a consequence of the spillover effect. A great example is the transportation system, as well as the labour groups, that are forcing unions to protect the rights of the workers in a more integrated and globalized world.

If we want to explain what is happening in the EU, questions of “why and how the EU has evolved in such a strong federal direction” (Burgess Page 35) Liberal Inter-Governmentalism said nothing. With examples as the Constitution of the EU and the political desire of the EU members to continue moving forward to a federal union. These examples makes us think that we should take a look to Federalist approaches and linked it with Neo-functionalism theories to explain what is happening in Europe, LAC, as well as in other parts of the world with regional organizations and the post modern state governance. Here is crucial the concept of spill over.

As pointed by Burgess, “The EU, we are reminded, is a political, economic, social, and legal hybrid that is characterized by a combination of federal, confederal, supranational, and intergovernmental features” (Burgess, Page 41) “At a minimum, the EU may be said to embody the federal principle of combining in a territorial and contractual sharing of power a degree of unity on the one hand with a

respect for the interests and partial autonomy of regional units on the other” (Nugent, page 424) “quasi-federal system. From the other side, LAC countries have articles and phrases in the preambles of their national Constitutions that imposed a mandate to pursue Latin American integration as a goal of each state. All this constitutional acts could be examples of a desire for a closer political union of LAC region. However LAC countries are really moving into a federal way, the same as the EU? These questions are relevant, because in Europe the process was in the opposite side. They signed treaties and later they claimed the sponsorship of national citizens, through plebiscites. In LAC those plebiscites existed before the integration happens, in particular the cases of Unasur and Aladi.

In the 1960’s LAC experienced a vast amount of integration examples based upon an economic concept of Imported Substitution from ECLAC (Raul Prebisch). By that time, the first step toward Latin American integration was the ALALC (Latin American Free Trade Association). This was a failed process, but was the basement for sub regional experiences as the Andean Community (1969) that later became involved in the new integration organization called ALADI (Latin American Association of Integration). All the goals among these countries were to develop their countries and create a common market in Latin America, but the first thing to do was to protect their national economies, before open it to the rest of the world.

The ANC was criticized because some members have different economic point of view. While Chile wanted free market and not the model of imported substitution, Ecuador and Bolivia claimed for a different treatment for being less developed than the other members. Venezuela joined the group and Chile denounced the treaty and for the past four decades, the ANC is considered an imperfect integration process that has hybrid examples of success and failure. In terms of institutions, the ANC is a clear copy of some of the EU institutions. The EU had supported any initiative in the Andean region since the beginning of the Andean Pact. What reason exist that keeps together those Andean countries? Why

Venezuela denounced the treaty and joined Mercosur? To answer these questions, we should take a look of spillover in a different way. If we see South America and Latin America as a region that has common traditions and same problems, integration is a dream that each one of the Latin-American governments will not forget never. No matter if some leave one sub regional group, it will join another one or promote the creation of others, just to express the anxiety to create the “Patria Grande”. That is the reason why they have this mandate in their political national constitutions.

So once Mercosur came into exist in 1994, the region was divided in two economic blocks, the ANC, and Mercosur, and the latter became more important in terms of territory and population, as well as opportunities for investment. But Chile still remained apart from the two exercises, as well as Guyana, Suriname and the Overseas European Territories.

In terms of trade and commerce, the two blocks increased their interdependence and in recent years the two blocks became observers and associates between one to each other of its members. After political events came into the region, testing the relative peace. Brazil proposed the creation of a block of South American countries, that later became Unasur. This proposition went far away than from trade and commerce and it was the opportunity to bind Chile and others that stayed apart from the economic experiences. As a reflection, one can say that economic integration in south America, spill over into political integration and is testing new challenges for the future to come, not only in terms of politics, but also in terms of trade.

While Unasur documents refers to this region as a zone of peace, they forgot to mention that the last war that took place there was in 1995 between Peru and Ecuador, and in 2008, when former President Uribe invaded Ecuador in a claim of just war against terrorism (killing one of the FARC’s leaders located in Ecuadorian territory). However, both events were solved in diplomatic ways and the causes of war were removed with the help of this new institution, as well as the OAS and the Carter center.

Unasur is an interesting case to study, because it could be the way to interconnect other Latin American experiences as well as the NAFTA and other parts of our world, if Brazil takes the lead and move others to think globally. Unasur has many fields, from electoral control, to education and trade, that show that the spillover concept function well in this case. The only problem that one can see from Unasur initiative is that its basement is in geographical line, so one can say, why France is excluded from it, if the French Guiana is still part of South America? Or in other hands, if in the past the Falkland islands (Malvinas) were cause of war between Argentina and the UK, how can we open our minds to see that each one of us are members of the same planet and those borders or frontiers in terms of power are just in our minds, not in our hearths? The spillover effect will help us to understand this is if someday we can integrate our world by what unite us, instead of what divide us. That means turn on the page and start building a better future all of us together.

In recent years Sub regional experiences as the ANC (this experiment started with Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru) and with Chile leaving the block in 1973 and Venezuela joined it in 1976. In 2006 under foreign policies of former Venezuelan president Chavez, Venezuela denounced the treaty because Peru and Colombia signed FTA's with the U.S. However, as a block, the ANC started a merging process with Mercosur (Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay). Both groups signed agreements to be observers among the nations that are part of both. After leaving the ANC Venezuela apply to become part of Mercosur, and Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina accepted that membership. The Paraguayan Congress blocked that insertion for several years, until the coup d'état that removed from office President Lugo. Because of that Paraguayan undemocratic decision, Mercosur members suspended Paraguay for being full member of the block. That suspension opened the opportunity for Venezuela to became member of Mercosur. However, the new President of Paraguay hesitates to return to the block and this is a political decision that shows what is happening in those sub regional groups in South America.

Bolivia signed the Protocol to become part of Mercosur in December 2012, and Ecuador is trying to become member of Mercosur. Presidents Morales (Bolivia) and Correa (Ecuador) had expressed in several times the intention of leaving the ANC, in rhetoric discourse against the Governments of Peru and Colombia for being allies of the U.S., and for signing FTA's with USA. While Peru and Colombia are open to free trade and economic integration among the entire region, but in particular with the USA and the EU, there is a block of countries like Ecuador, Bolivia and Venezuela that reject that idea. However, since 1998, both blocks (Mercosur and ANC) are trying to merge into a free trade area and at present time all members are associate states of each block, those members of Mercosur are associates of the ANC and vice versa.^{xxxvi} One can say that both sub regional blocks are the seeds of Unasur.

But Unasur has brought to us the same mistake. They are separating our region by walls. We are separated (only in our minds) into three different parts that are complemented one to another. North, Central, and South America. If we change the prism through which we see our world, and our region, we could say that they are just parts of the same body. Continents or regions, belong to one world, as well as our countries as just smaller parts of those regions and sub regions. We share two big oceans (Pacific and Atlantic) that separate our continent from other regions of our World. We can still be the bridge that connects the West and the East of our world (Asia, Europe, Oceania and Africa), not only in terms of commerce through the Isthmus of Panama, but in terms of faith and hope for a better future of our entire human family. If we add the media, Internet, the flight connections and all those new technologies that we have developed, we are more than integrated within our countries, and with other parts of our world. We should use all those great resources in a positive way, for the good of each one of us, here in this planet.

However, the key question to ask in any society is how we can keep all parts together, satisfying the needs of each member, and respecting the differences from one to another? Or in other words, is unity inside diversity, the key for the balance of power and the way to create more developed societies? How

can we avoid divisions and wars, creating spaces to connect nations, in order to preserve peace in a region or in the whole world? The history of the USA –a well as EU- is full of episodes of division, violence and civil war, all made by different circumstances and opinions from the perspective of the politicians and civil society members inside the federation. But through 237 years, the Union is still valid for all members, and it is preserved in unity, among its diversity. This is the consequence of four basic pillars: God, liberal democracy, checks and balances and the rule of law.

The Functional Approach

David Mitrany considered this approach more than a theory an anxiety to solve the problems of society, I totally agree with that affirmation, in a time when mankind (men and women) needs proposals that satisfy their needs, according to their human nature. If we could see that frontiers or borders exist only in our minds, we need to change the way we look or approach the problems of our society.

In a nutshell, Mitrany propose a functional approach in spite of the constitutional approach, trying to see the big picture of society problems. As pointed by him, *“peace will not be secured if we organize the world by what divides it”* (Mitrany, Page 111). From this point of view power will always be a cause of division, and nobody wants to be governed by others, while those are tyrants, fascists or nationalists that only see their egos. If we want to secure peace, we should embraces a system that moves people prepared to satisfied the needs of the people, and the solution is not changing politicians for technocrats (international bureaucrats) the solution is to have in both places virtuous people, those that Madison talked about it more than 200 years ago. That is the reason for using in this thesis the functional approach, in my case with a Moral perspective, where service to each member of our society is the common good of the people in any society. Here we need local authorities (those of municipalities, as wells as the nations and regions) that work together not fighting for power, but cooperating for satisfying the needs of others as well as theirs.

I was considering the example of current Ecuadorian President, Rafael Correa who does not accept the imposition of international organizations. He is a strong critic of the World Bank, the IDB, the OAS and other international organizations. In his book *“Ecuador: De Banana Republic a la No Republica”*, Correa mentioned that the representative of the World Bank caused a really bad impression to him when he was Minister of Finance, before running to the Presidency. Once in the Presidency, Correa expelled him from Ecuador and closed relations with the World Bank and the IMF (Correa is a strong critic of the Washington Consensus). That example shows that in the Andean region, not only Bretton Woods institutions, but other regional and sub regional ones, does not have the reputation and idealistic form that Mitrany or Hass discussed in their theoretical proposals. They forgot to include that any institution, or organization, no matter if it is private or public, national or international, municipal or regional, relies upon the moral virtues of its human members and authorities. That is the key piece of the puzzle to recover credibility among the people who claims for change. If the government is corrupted, the private sector will be immersed it inside that system. No matter if we create supranational institutions, international organizations, or any kind of structure, it would not work, unless there is balance in between them, and that only could happen when the system satisfies the needs of all men and women, in particular children and women, as pointed by Aristotle many years ago.

Latin America, the new laboratory for Neo-functionalists

To say that something is functional is to say that it works^{xxxvii}, and a functional international society satisfies the needs of all their members, creating opportunities for every one in order to find the place for every person and nation in this world. *“There are nearly 7 billion reasons to study international affairs at Fletcher”*, but the first one to me, is that we all are members of the same family, the *human family who lives in this amazing world*^{xxxviii}, composed of more than 7 billion souls that came into this world with a great reason, we just need to find what it is for each one of us. We need to learn and respect

how others see our family, as well as understand the problems that we all face together in order to solve and prevent them.

As David Mitrany pointed, *national problems are local segments of the same problems*; so we need to be creative to promote ways to interconnect people among our Nations, in order to solve those problems. For example, it is difficult for me to see differences in acts of terrorism, no matter if they are in Boston, New York or Bogota. They are the same terrorist attacks. Unjust war, public or private corruption, traffic (with humans or drugs) show us that criminals do not recognize frontiers, and that they are more integrated for committing crimes, than nations to prevent it or fight against them. If we turn to natural disasters or diseases, we see that all of them have something in common: they do not recognize frontiers. Only when those needs are claimed in a revolution or a catastrophe is when the political power turns on in an emergency to react and think in “Marshall Plans” to rebuild what was destroyed.

Traditional ways of cooperation among states are just part of the solution, but integration should be the engine that puts into action the system, to prevent and react against a common threat. The end of the Cold-War and Bipolarity converted our world into a multipolar world, and new regionalism shows that the world is still creating divisions and motivating separations by regions, instead of claiming for a world union of nations (the goal of each integration process). We could see a EU more integrated and more enlarged during the past two decades, and a closer union that still persist in the middle of the worst crisis in its history. In Latin America we see new waves of integration, from political integration as UNASUR or CELAC, to economic integration as The Pacific Alliance. An old experiment that mixed some of both, the ALADI is resurging. Both Mercosur and the Andean Community were created as sub regions inside the ALADI project of Latin American integration. However all those experiments are leaving behind the US and Canada. All Latin American countries did not accept US initiatives, as the FTAA, so the USA has to change its path to free trade agreements with countries as Colombia, Peru and

Panama. Inter-American institutions like the OAS are losing opportunities and leaving spaces that are covered by those new sub regional initiatives.

We shall need well educated and prepared leaders, as well as with logical framework, and reason, to interpret the social phenomena that each day came to us and respond adequately to any new challenge that future brings. Only appreciating our differences and remembering that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, we can develop more opportunities for the entire human race. And here is important to not exclude and divide, we need to include and multiply.

Each part is important for the subsistence of the whole. Unless one part disappears or is damaged, the system has to do something (repair or rebuild) to keep all the other parts in function. We should coexist in peace and justice in this planet. We live in the same world in which we share the land, the air, the ocean, the animals and plants that provide us our food and energy to live and be happy with our families. We should respect our environment that does not recognize borders when earthquakes, natural disasters or wars destroy our peace. And to be prepared for those times of crisis, we must be integrated to help one to each other. To enjoy the three goods that Aristotle talked about: *external goods, goods of the body, and goods of the soul*. An integrated international society that works, is that one where we replace the variables that creates groups of regions or sub regions by territories or by political divisions. Following the Aristotelian philosophy, we should recover virtue and wisdom as the engine for happiness, only then we could see other spaces to integrate our countries.

TPA (The Pacific Alliance) is an example to study. It is a new experiment, and there is not too much information about their results, but to test the spillover effect here, we have to take into consideration that Panama and Costa Rica will be full members of that alliance in months. Canada is an observer of the initiative and probably in the long term the USA could be part of it, because it has all the requirements that the treaty required.

There is not too much information about both cases, because they are starting their paths, but whatever it comes in the region, both examples will have something to say in terms of what is the better approach to create a functional system in the Americas. One from geographical thinking, or one with economic and trade agreements. Spillover is at hands in the region, and the future years will test this concepts and will open the gate to internal debates to see that nobody has the truth in his mind, we just have different approaches to the same problems, that is why integration is not about going beyond the nation-state is more an opportunity to adapt it and create a web of interrelations from all centers of power, from local to universal. That is why all politics is local. We need people that teach how to fish, and that depends only in the good education of the youth, as Loyola pointed hundreds of years ago. But we need to start acting now. One great example of a task that each society has to take a look is education and service. From the USA we have the Peace Corps program, a great example to connect different worlds and to learn. USAID is another example. But in our region, only the Andres Bello Pact is trying to do something in regional terms of education, but this is an empty land ready to work.

5. Conclusion

We need creativity and elasticity to build an international society that allow each and everyone of the persons in this world, to work and live in prosperity, pursuing their happiness. But to have this utopian society is not a matter of dreaming, it is a natural choice when you change the variables that moves the system. We just need to ask why not? Instead of conflict, we should use service, and instead of power we should use integration. We need to form and educate our youth in this world to create points of union in between all Nations and a working peace system that claimed for a world union, in which everyone could enjoy those goods. However, sometimes human nature appears to be moved by egoism, envy, ambition vices –as opposite to virtues-, that misbalances the system, in particular when people wants to achieve the superfluous, instead of the necessary. Aristotle said that the worst crimes are committed by obtaining the superfluous, not the necessary. So this research thesis wants to open the debate to find what needs and goods we should satisfy? If all politics is local, we need to think globally and act locally. That means that we need intergovernmental relations, inter-municipal, inter private, as well as supranational ones to create a new system that put emphasis in individuals, not in states. We need politicians, but we need technocrats, as well as civil society actors that move the international system based on virtues of their leaders. Neither the realist, nor the functionalist has the magic answer for everything. We just have to find what is our vocation, work hard to help others and empower them for the three goods that Aristotle mentioned many years ago. UNASUR and TPA are examples to test this functional approach and the spillover trough the Americas, which could open the gate to a greater spill over for a world union: towards the Atlantic, and towards the Pacific. My question was partially right, we are moving into a political integration. But it is based in treaties and constitutions that reject what Mitrany offered. LAC is still creating walls, instead of bridges. However, the TPA could be the bridge, if others follow that path voluntarily.

Bibliography

1. Arizmendi Posada, Octavio, and Sanin Echeverri, Jaime; "Manifiesto a Hispanoamerica", Bogota, Second edition, 1985.
2. Acharya, Amitav, and Iain Johnston, Comparing regional institutions
3. Bradshaw, John; *Reclaiming Virtue, How we can develop the moral intelligence to do the right thing at the right time and for the right reason*, Bantam Book, New York, May 2009
4. Cason, Jeffrey W., *The Political Economy of Integration, The experience of Mercosur*, Routledge, New York, 2011
5. Dabene, Olivier; "The Politics of Regional integration in Latin America", Palgrave Macmillan, 2009
6. Elistrup-Sanjiovanni ed, *Debates on European Integration: A Reader (2006)*
7. Estevadeordal, Antoni and others; "Integrating the Americas", Harvard University, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, 2004
8. Franco, Andres, and Robles, Francisco; "Integración: un marco teórico", Magazine Colombia Internacional, Bogota, Universidad de Los Andes, 1995
9. Helen Wallace, Mark Pollack and Alasdair Young *Policy Making in the European Union (Sixth edition, 2010)*, especially Chapters 2 and 4. [This book and Nugent include references to the most important theoretical writings on the EU – you should review all of that literature]
10. Haas, Ernst; *Beyond the Nation State, Functionalism and International Organization*, Stanford University, 1968
11. Karns, Margaret P., and Mingst, Karen A.; "International Organizations" Boulder, Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2010
12. McDonald, Forrest; "E Pluribus Unum The formation of the American Republic 1776 - 1790" The Riberside Press Cambridge, Boston 1965
13. Mitrany, David, *A working peace system*, Quadrangle Books, 1966, the society for a World Service Federation.
14. Mitrany, David, *The functional approach to World Organization, International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* Vol. 24, No. 3 (Jul, 1948)
15. McKinney, Joseph and Gardner, Stephen; "Economic Integration in the Americas", Routledge, 2008
16. Moses, Bernard; "The intellectual background of the revolution in South America, 1810 – 1824", The Hispanic Society of America, New York, 1926
17. Nugent, Neill, *The Government and Politics of the European Union (7th ed., 2010)*
18. Pinder, John, and Usherwood, Simon; "The European Union", New York, Oxford University Press, 2007
19. Preusse, Heinz G.; "The new American Regionalism", Edward Elgar Publishing, 2004
20. Rosamond, Ben, *Theories of European Integration*, Palgrave, New York, 2000
21. Sanin S.J., Javier; "Alternativas para la Comunidad Andina frente al ALCA y a Mercosur", Fundación Konrad Adenauer – Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogota, 2004
22. Thies, Sebastian, Raab Josef; "E pluribus Unum? National and Transnational identities in the Americas", Berlin, 2009
23. US-LA Council on Foreign Relations, Report of an independent task force, # 60, May 2008
24. Useche, Ruben; "El Parlamento Andino dentro del Nuevo esquema de integración andina", Quito, 2000
25. Wallace, Pollack and Young, *Policy-Making in the European Union*, Oxford University Press, 2010
26. Wiener and T. Diez eds, *European Integration Theory (2nd ed., 2009)*
27. Zakaria, Fareed; "The Future of Freedom", New York W. W. Norton, 2007

Endnotes

- ⁱ Quotations of George Washington (Great American Quote Books) Applewood Books, 2004
- ⁱⁱ Aristotle, Politics, <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/politics.7.seven.html>
- ⁱⁱⁱ Luis Ugalde S.J., “San Ignacio de Loyola y la Universidad”, Universidad Católica Andres Bello, Caracas 1990 <http://www.slideshare.net/gomagua/san-ignacio-de-loyola-y-la-universidad>
- ^{iv} Address Before the Irish Parliament in Dublin, June 28, 1963 <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/IPAi7jx2s0i7kePPdJnUXA.aspx>
- ^v Bolivar, Simon; Jamaica Letter, Kingston, 1815 <http://faculty.smu.edu/bakewell/BAKEWELL/texts/jamaica-letter.html>
- ^{vi} With all the respect for those who claim the name America just to described one part of the continent, I will present my apologies for using it for the entire continent, including North, Central and South America. However in this thesis I will use indistinctly The Americas or America, when referring to our home.
- ^{vii} The idea of using these Latin quotes of “E PLURIBUS UNUM” and “EX UNO PLURA” in this sense, it is mentioned in a short essay titled “Manifiesto a Hispanoamerica” (Manifiesto to Hispanic America) by Octavio Arizmendi Posada and Jaime Sanin Echeverry, second edition, Bogota, 1985 (Pages 7- 8)
- ^{viii} This not applies to Brazil, because the Portuguese colonies had united into one federated country.
- ^{ix} Christopher Columbus offered his travel to this land in honor to the Holy Trinity, that is the root of the name of Trinidad and Tobago.
- ^x The peoples of our countries are showing interest on being part of both cultures, as is the case of the Hispanic population living in the US, that in 2010 was of 50.5 million 16% and is expected to grow until 102.6 million by 2050 <http://www.census.gov/population/hispanic/data/2011.html>
http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hispanic/hispanic_pop_presentation.html
- ^{xi} I use the term America to refer to the three Americas (North, Central and South) as a whole. In one of the discussion of International Politics class I suggested a name for this initiative, I called it the **AMERICAS CONSENSUS**, just to ask if the North and the South could join together in a new path for this XXI century and became one unique America, from Canada to Argentina.
- ^{xii} I took these words from the title of the book “America the last best hope” by William J. Bennet, who took this idea from former President A. Lincoln.
- ^{xiii} The population of Latin America and the Caribbean is 582,600,000; the population of the USA is 316,226,650, and the population of Canada is 34,278,400, in total these numbers sum **929,976,357 (total population of the Americas and the Caribbean)**
Latin American and Caribbean population number comes from the World Bank site:
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/LACEXT/0,,contentMDK:22117191~pagePK:146736~piPK:146830~theSitePK:258554,00.html#map>
The US population number comes from the Census Bureau Office site: <http://www.census.gov/main/www/popclock.html>
The Canadian population number comes from Statistics Canada website:
<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/110324/dq110324b-eng.htm>
- ^{xiv} This precision is necessary because some authors consider that Unasur was an initiative from Venezuela and Chavez, and that is incorrect, it was a Brazilian initiative supported by Venezuela, among other leaders in the region. This information was confirmed during an interview with Mrs. Daniela Benjamin, Brazilian advisor at Unasur headquarters in Quito, January, 2012 For more historic details about Unasur, please visit: <http://www.unasursg.org/inicio/organizacion/historia>
- ^{xv} France is part of South America with this continental piece of overseas territory, as well as the UK and the Netherlands with their islands in the Atlantic. If geographic integration is the argument, we can ask why Unasur members did not open the gate to European countries to be part of this integration process? We are still looking at things that divide us, instead of those that unite us.
- ^{xvi} The French sociologist Michel Chevalier in 1836, used this term to opposed North America (Anglo-Saxon and Protestant) and Latin America (Latino and Catholic)
- ^{xvii} <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/29/remarks-vice-president-us-brazil-relations-rio-de-janeiro-brazil>
- ^{xviii} <http://moneyweek.com/pacific-alliance-a-new-latin-american-superpower-63300/>
- ^{xix} We stand on those fourth critical issues to work with in our region from “US – Latin American Relations: A new direction for a new reality”, Council on Foreign Relations, No. 60, May 2008
- ^{xx} Karns and Mingst, 2010 P. 178
- ^{xxi} http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/AboutUs/zurich_e.htm
- ^{xxii} Although there has been numerous and different types of integration in Latin America, in this thesis I see the process of integration as an overarching process, including the sub-regional as well as the regional experiences. Some of them are covered under GATT’s (WTO) rules as well as ALADI’s foundations, to create blocks of countries for free trade with the goal of achieving a Free Trade Market and a Region, as the Latin America Free Trade Market, or the ideal of a region of security and democratic peace promoted by the OAS and/or UNASUR.
- ^{xxiii} Idea extracted from the class of Professor Rafael Nieto Navia, International Law course at Javeriana University in Bogota, 1992. Here we posited that the school of natural law is a standpoint to better understand why some events happen in history, as a rational expression of what nature imprinted in our minds.
- ^{xxiv} Regionalism as a threat is an idea largely entrenched in the IR literature.
- ^{xxv} Reference to words of King Saint Stephen of Hungary; “Hungria en la Union Europea” Márta Konrád / János Vándor, Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2004 www.mfa.gov.hu/NR/rdonlyres/7B595C10-904B.../0/EU_es.pdf (accessed on March 2011)
- ^{xxvi} From the Song “America, America”, performed by Nino Bravo and reedited by Luis Miguel
- ^{xxvii} As praised by the song ONE, Bono, performed by U2.
- ^{xxviii} The one that I had since I left my country, Colombia, to live in Ecuador, and later in the USA.
- ^{xxix} Diccionario de la lengua Española on line <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=integraci%C3%B3n> <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=integrar>
- ^{xxx} My faith and believe in God, it does not interfere with anyone who do not believe in God. This sentence is my premise that anything comes from our human nature, and we have to discover it by ourselves at each level of development and wisdom, not by force.
- ^{xxxi} 1 Corinthians, Chapter 12 http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0839/_PZH.HTM
- ^{xxxii} The term “Human Family” is extracted from the Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church and the UN Declaration of Human Rights.
- ^{xxxiii} Common Good is related to the concept developed by the Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church
- ^{xxxiv} <http://www.gallup.com/poll/161435/100-million-worldwide-dream-life.aspx>
- ^{xxxv} As pointed by Niemann and Schmitter, “Both Haas and Lindberg held integration to be a process as opposed to an outcome or (end-) state, Wiener, Antje; Diez Thomas; “European Integration Theory” second edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2009
- ^{xxxvi} <http://www.comunidadandina.org/Seccion.aspx?id=111&tipo=TE&title=mercosur>
- ^{xxxvii} Bradshaw, John, “Bradshaw on: The Family” Page 43, 51, ISBN: 978-1-55874-427-4 <http://www.johnbradshaw.com/bradshawonthefamilybook-1.aspx>
- ^{xxxviii} Term used in the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church, available at:
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/documents/rc_pc_justpeace_doc_20060526_compendio-dott-soc_en.html#Role%20of%20the%20free%20market