

POLITICAL CHANGE AND
U.S. STRATEGIC CONCERNS
IN THE CARIBBEAN

W. Andrew Axline
University of Ottawa

- CAPITALISM, SOCIALISM, AND TECHNOLOGY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CUBA AND JAMAICA.* By CHARLES EDQUIST. (London: Zed Books, 1985. Pp. 182. \$26.25 cloth, \$10.25 paper.)
- THE CARIBBEAN.* Edited by ROBERT O. MATTHEWS and CHARLES PENTLAND. Special issue of *International Journal* (Volume 40, Spring 1985). (Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1985. Pp. 396. \$5.20.)
- THE CARIBBEAN BASIN TO THE YEAR 2000: DEMOGRAPHIC, ECONOMIC, AND RESOURCE-USE TRENDS IN SEVENTEEN COUNTRIES.* By NORMAN A. GRAHAM and KEITH L. EDWARDS. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984. Pp. 166. \$18.50.)
- CARIBBEAN CONTOURS.* Edited by SIDNEY W. MINTZ and SALLY PRICE. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985. Pp. 250. \$25.00 cloth, \$9.95 paper.)
- THE CARIBBEAN: SURVIVAL, STRUGGLE, AND SOVEREIGNTY.* By CATHERINE SUNSHINE. (Washington, D.C.: Ecumenical Program for Inter-american Communication and Action, 1985. Pp. 232. \$8.50.)
- CONFRONTATION IN THE CARIBBEAN BASIN: INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON SECURITY, SOVEREIGNTY, AND SURVIVAL.* Edited by ALAN ADELMAN and REID READING. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984. Pp. 307. \$9.50.)
- THE ECONOMICS OF THE CARIBBEAN BASIN.* Edited by MICHAEL CONNOLLY and JOHN MCDERMOTT. (New York: Praeger, 1985. Pp. 355. \$41.95.)
- GRENADA: REVOLUTION AND INVASION.* By ANTHONY PAYNE, PAUL SUTTON, and TONY THORNDIKE. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984. Pp. 233. \$19.95.)
- GRENADA AND SOVIET/CUBAN POLICY: INTERNAL CRISIS AND U.S./OECIS INTERVENTION.* Edited by JIRI VALENTA and HERBERT J. ELLISON. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1986. Pp. 512. \$35.00 cloth, \$17.50 paper.)

THE OTHER SIDE OF PARADISE: FOREIGN CONTROL IN THE CARIBBEAN.

By TOM BARRY, BETH WOOD, and DEB PREUSCH. (New York: Grove Press, 1984. Pp. 405. \$9.95.)

PERIPHERAL CAPITALISM AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT IN ANTIGUA.

By PAGET HENRY. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1984. Pp. 220. \$24.95.)

POWER IN THE CARIBBEAN BASIN: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POLITICAL

ECONOMY. By CARL STONE. (Philadelphia, Pa.: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1986. Pp. 159. \$29.95.)

In the eighteenth century, the Caribbean received at least as much attention from the major world powers as it does today. Called "the cockpit of Europe," it became the central arena for the battles between the major international powers—France and England—for political control of the international system. Today some observers clearly believe that the Caribbean is again a region where the major world powers are competing for control of the international system, with the protagonists being the United States and the Soviet Union.

The novelty of the renewed interest in the Caribbean lies less in perceptions of the region than in the divergent interpretations of how to define the region.¹ A different concept (although not a new one) has recently been dominating discussions of the region, one reflected in the increased usage of the term *Caribbean Basin*, which refers to all the islands in the Caribbean Sea plus Mexico, Central America, and the northern littoral states of South America.

An obvious two-way relationship exists between the definition of a region that one chooses and one's perception of the reality of that region. The concept chosen most closely reflects one's understanding of the nature of the problems of the region. Perhaps less obvious is the way that the choice of definition can determine the nature of that reality.

David Singer has argued convincingly that the level of analysis chosen in looking at questions of international relations has significant impact on the theoretical understanding of any problem, and consequently on the analyst's perception of reality.² Recent studies of the contemporary Caribbean demonstrate how the choice of level of analysis affects the interpretation of Caribbean economics and politics and U.S. policy toward the region.

By defining the region in terms of the shared historical experiences of certain countries and the contemporary sociopolitical realities that flow from those experiences, analysts get one perspective on the problems of the contemporary Caribbean. The Commonwealth Caribbean is one concept based on this approach. In contrast, the Caribbean Basin concept reflects a preoccupation with American geostrategic con-

cerns because it is based on a perspective of the region as an arena in which the United States and the Soviet Union pursue their Cold War rivalry.

The Commonwealth Caribbean

Perhaps ironically, the defining characteristics of the societies of the Commonwealth Caribbean today are the historical legacy of an economic and strategic rivalry between the global powers of two centuries ago. The Commonwealth Caribbean consists of those countries that were or still are colonies of the United Kingdom and whose formal political institutions were modeled on Westminster and Whitehall: Anguilla, Antigua, the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Turks and Caicos.³

The contemporary political economy of the region can be traced directly to the British colonial experience, with its dominant pattern of sugar cultivation based on slave labor in the West Indies.⁴ The result of this externally determined development has been termed *the plantation society* and has been analyzed by a number of scholars.⁵ Although the development of plantations resulted in increased production and income, the degree to which generalized development could be achieved through structural transformation was limited by foreign ownership of plantations, the high import content of plantation investment, and consumer import propensity. Increases in population further limited the benefits of development, while the linkages of plantations with enterprises in the British Isles generated wealth in Britain rather than in the West Indies. The low-level skills required for plantation work left the income distribution of the society highly skewed. In effect, the plantation economy constituted a major impediment to development and became the central defining characteristic of the region referred to as the Commonwealth Caribbean.

The Caribbean Basin

The Caribbean Basin concept unites a group of countries located in and around the Caribbean Sea by viewing these countries as being of geostrategic importance to the United States.⁶ This conception of the region depends not on any characteristics of the individual member countries nor on their regional interrelationship but on an external perception of an arena of the Cold War at the global level involving the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Some scholars maintain that the basin concept has no apparent utility outside geography, perhaps. Too many differences in language,

culture, racial mix, political institutions, and economic development preclude subsuming these countries under a single descriptor. Others argue that the term can be used legitimately, that it is quite reasonable to view the nations of Central America and the insular Caribbean as part of a unit because of their experience as small states subordinate to outside interests and because their patterns of social change reflect this experience. This argument holds that it is also reasonable to include Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and the United States within this framework because the smaller states have considered the economic assistance of these larger countries crucial and because potential problems of immigration and revolutionary spillover give the larger powers an important stake in the future of the smaller nations.⁷

The clearest basis for the Caribbean Basin concept is found in strategic logic. It is argued that the Caribbean cannot be separated from its surrounding land mass because the Caribbean Basin states are linked geostrategically. Political and military development may not be contained within one country or subregion and can be transmitted to others, as evidenced by the effects of Cuban, Nicaraguan, and Grenadian actions on other states.⁸

The Caribbean Basin concept reflects a highly ideological worldview of strong bipolarity and macrolinkage of international events within and across regions, a view that envisions the United States in the position of responding to an aggressive world challenge by the Soviet Union.⁹ Although the Caribbean Basin concept has little meaning outside the United States, it is not a new idea. It came to the fore again recently in 1981, when the U.S. Defense Department reorganized its regional defense network, reflecting a new unified conceptualization of the region in U.S. strategic thinking and the growing importance that the United States has ascribed to military considerations in approaching the problems of the region.¹⁰ The Caribbean Basin is viewed as simply another arena in the bipolar struggle for power, where the main problem is Communist expansion orchestrated by the USSR, often through what are perceived as Soviet "proxies" or potential proxies—Cuba, Grenada, and Nicaragua.

Although the Caribbean Basin perspective does not completely ignore or preclude consideration of economic, cultural, and political aspects of the individual countries of Central America and the Caribbean, it relegates these aspects to subordinate roles and defines their significance entirely in terms of U.S. strategic interests. This orientation has occasioned criticism of the concept of the Caribbean Basin as inadequate for understanding the true nature of the region's problems because the overriding concern is to limit Cuban-Soviet influence. The basin concept's attempt to join the Caribbean and Central America within a single regional framework out of ideological and strategic con-

cerns imposes an arbitrary geopolitical definition that takes little account of the structures of regional integration in the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM) and the Central American Common Market.¹¹

The impact of the Caribbean Basin concept as a definition of the region is clearly reflected in recent writings on the Caribbean in the form of a marked shift in focus to the larger area incorporating Central America, the Caribbean archipelago, and the littoral states of South America. An examination of some of this literature will reveal the effects of this focus.

Security and Development in the Caribbean

It is not surprising that since 1980 many writings on the Caribbean have adopted the Caribbean Basin perspective, either dealing explicitly with the strategic implications of recent events in the region or adopting this perspective implicitly by lumping together the countries of the Caribbean, Central America, and northern South America as a convenient "regional" definition.

Security and development lie at the center of the different emphases and understanding of the contemporary Caribbean. The Caribbean Basin perspective is concerned with the East-West dimensions of global relations, while the historically based concept of the region is preoccupied with the North-South dimensions. Security in the former perspective implies U.S. concern with Soviet Communism on a global scale, while in the latter context, security refers to the difficulties of small states in maintaining a viable economic and political unit that can deal with their social problems through development.

Development requires economic, social, and political change. From the Caribbean Basin perspective, change implies instability, which is perceived as being fomented or exploited by Soviet and Cuban revolutionary activities, and therefore a threat to security. From a national development perspective, the imposition of stability by the United States implies a resistance to change necessary for development and a threat to national security. The invasion of Grenada is perhaps the most extreme example of a threat to national security that denies the possibility of pursuing national objectives.¹²

Three recent publications that begin with the Caribbean Basin perspective are Graham and Edwards's *The Caribbean Basin to the Year 2000*, Valenta and Ellison's *Grenada and Soviet/Cuban Policy*, and Adelman and Reading's *Confrontation in the Caribbean Basin*. Analyses of the Caribbean that start from the national perspective can be found in Connolly and McDermott's *The Economics of the Caribbean Basin*, Edquist's *Capitalism, Socialism, and Technology*, Henry's *Peripheral Capitalism and*

Underdevelopment in Antigua, Mintz and Price's *Caribbean Contours*, and Stone's *Power in the Caribbean Basin*. Finally, a number of works focus on the interaction between the international and national levels of analysis, showing the relationships among national, regional, and international factors. These works include Barry, Wood, and Preusch's *The Other Side of Paradise*, Matthews and Pentland's *The Caribbean*, Payne, Sutton, and Thorndike's *Grenada: Revolution and Invasion*, and Sunshine's *The Caribbean: Survival, Struggle, and Sovereignty*.

Caribbean Contours, edited by Sidney Mintz and Sally Price, covers the broad historical, political, and socioeconomic background of the Caribbean to create a rich tapestry depicting the diversity of the region and the difficulties of trying to arrive at a definition of the Caribbean that provides a basis for generalization, no matter how restrictive that definition may be. At the same time, the book makes clear that without some familiarity with the subjects it treats (race, language, and music) as well as the political structure, plantation tradition, and the role of sugar, no understanding of the Caribbean can be complete.

In contrast to this collection, but at the same "micro" level of analysis, is Paget Henry's *Peripheral Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Antigua*, which explains how one Commonwealth Caribbean country arrived at its present state of underdevelopment. The work situates the specifics of the Antiguan case within a general comparative framework of peripheral development, which in turn allows for theoretical contributions to the more general framework of peripheral development and underdevelopment in the Caribbean.

Less relevant to the Caribbean countries or to the Caribbean Basin is the collection of papers presented at a conference in Santo Domingo in December 1983 and published as *The Economics of the Caribbean Basin*, edited by Michael Connolly and John McDermott. The title apparently borrows the basin term in order to follow the current trend, as one finds little coherence in the essays around this concept or any other. With the exception of the section dealing with government policy (in Haiti, Jamaica, and Costa Rica) and a comparative study of investment in nine countries, the volume is mainly oriented toward theoretical problems of small, open, underdeveloped economies.

The evolution of Caribbean societies during the past several centuries is placed in contemporary context by two books that analyze the relationship between international influences and national social and political conditions. Catherine Sunshine's *The Caribbean: Survival, Struggle, and Sovereignty* and the analysis of foreign control in the region by Tom Barry, Beth Wood, and Deb Preusch cover the contemporary Caribbean from a comprehensive perspective that borrows from the dependency tradition. These useful works detail the relationship between external influences and domestic problems, including chapters on indi-

vidual Caribbean countries and their relations with specific industrialized countries.

The special edition of *International Journal* dedicated to the Caribbean also presents a broad survey of the region's contemporary problems. It takes into consideration recent American foreign policy and militarization of the region as well as the effect of these trends at national and regional levels.

Although *The Caribbean Basin to the Year 2000* adopts the geostrategic perspective of the Caribbean Basin concept, it contributes little to understanding the region or the debate surrounding events there. It aims to provide a comparative study of demographic, economic, and resource-use trends and their long-term implications for U.S. interests and security, and it includes data on seventeen Caribbean Basin countries projected to the year 2000. This study relies mainly on published official sources of international agencies (such as the World Bank) or U.S. government sources, and its definition of the region seems to have been determined by the data available in these documents. A major reason why the U.S. Department of State commissioned this study was to supersede the *Global 2000* report and to provide more detailed analysis of data on specific countries of the region beyond that available in UN and other published reports.¹³ The work utilizes neither public documents from individual countries nor statistics from individual governments or regional organizations such as CARICOM or the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

This work's analysis of the relationships among demographic, economic, and environmental trends is superficial. For example, the discussion of availability of arable land makes no mention at all of land distribution or land reform, and urban crime seems to be equated with political violence. In general, the methods used in the study outstrip the data used. The geostrategic element of the Caribbean Basin perspective is reflected in the general view that instability in the region is inimical to U.S. interests.

The greatest insight into the importance of the level of analysis to understanding recent events in the Caribbean can be obtained by examining U.S. policy toward the Caribbean. The Caribbean Basin Initiative and the invasion of Grenada are the most important examples of this policy, the latter having received the greatest attention in recent publications.

Grenada: Revolution and Invasion, by Anthony Payne, Paul Sutton, and Tony Thorndike, provides a well-documented account of events in Grenada, not merely the aftermath of the American invasion but the long- and short-term background that led up to it. Their analysis of the situation in Grenada before the New Jewel Movement (NJM) came to power and of the internal politics of the People's Revolutionary Govern-

ment (PRG) illuminates the sequence that culminated in the invasion. These events are also analyzed in the context of Grenada's relationship with Cuba, the Commonwealth Caribbean, and international politics. Finally, the book analyzes the impact of the invasion and its aftermath on the politics of the Caribbean itself, a subject not covered in studies using the Caribbean Basin perspective because of the preoccupation with U.S. security concerns rather than those internal to the region.

Most imbued with the Caribbean Basin concept are two edited volumes of papers dealing with U.S. foreign policy in the region that emphasize the invasion of Grenada. The first, *Grenada and Soviet/Cuban Policy* edited by Jiri Valenta and Herbert Ellison, is dedicated entirely to the invasion. The second, *Confrontation in the Caribbean Basin* edited by Alan Adelman and Reid Reading, focuses generally on security questions in the region. These two collections reflect the view that the reason for studying the Caribbean is its importance to U.S. security. Other aspects of the region are important only as they impinge on the security question. The papers in the Adelman and Reading volume were written before the Grenada invasion and discuss the problems of the region more broadly. The collection includes chapters on El Salvador and Guatemala, Nicaragua, the English-speaking Caribbean, Mexico, Venezuela, and Cuba as well as essays on U.S. policy toward Latin America, Soviet strategy, and the role of Western Europe in the Caribbean Basin. The papers in the Valenta and Ellison collection were written after the Grenada invasion and are based on the captured PRG documents that were given to each contributor.

From these writings can be discerned a number of patterns, some of which have been detailed above. First of all, the Caribbean Basin level of analysis perceives development questions as subordinate to and dependent on security considerations. These issues are often perceived simply as questions of stability and change, the latter being implicitly equated with instability and potentially grave consequences for U.S. security interests. Second, questions of poverty, social inequality, injustice, and political oppression are seen not so much as problems themselves nor as problems of Caribbean societies but as problems likely to lead to demands for change, hence instability, hence security problems for the United States.

Adelman points out in his introduction to *Confrontation in the Caribbean Basin* that most publications seem to polarize around perspectives of "solidarity" versus "national security," although the collection contains divergent points of view on this question (p. 4). The Caribbean Basin perspective forces debate on this issue into a narrow range of political points of view, the "liberal" versus the "conservative" elements of the relatively homogeneous American political ideology. Sally Shelton points out in her comment in *Grenada and Soviet/Cuban Policy*

that liberals discover origins of revolutionary change in economic deterioration while conservatives focus on the Soviet-Cuban threat. This distinction is underlined by James Malloy's comments on Howard Wiarda's contribution on U.S. foreign policy in Latin America in *Confrontation in the Caribbean Basin*; Malloy begins with the major criticism that it is difficult to tell whether Wiarda is criticizing or supporting the present administration.

The narrowness of the American "liberal versus conservative" distinction becomes starkly apparent on noting the contrast between U.S. authors and others. Colin Legum, Wolf Grabendorff, Anthony Payne, Paul Sutton, Tony Thorndike, Kari Polanyi-Levitt, and the Caribbean authors all take a very different perspective on the centrality of U.S. security interests in the Caribbean, and hence a different interpretation of the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the invasion of Grenada.

Legum points out in his contribution to the Valenta and Ellison collection that the Grenada documents are not likely to change fundamental Third World attitudes toward the invasion of Grenada and that Cuban and Soviet involvement in Grenada simply repeats similar conditions in other countries such as Angola, Ethiopia, and South Yemen. He also observes that documentary evidence of Soviet military supplies and Cuban military assistance is unlikely to differ much from that found in the archives of many nonaligned nations. It is unlikely to be either shocking or revealing, except among those governments hostile to the USSR and Cuba. Legum further argues that movements like the NJM exist in other parts of the world and are not necessarily considered a threat to their neighbors, even by those neighbors who might disapprove. Similar governments have been transformed by purely domestic forces or as a result of regional influences, as in Zanzibar, the Seychelles, and Mauritius. Legum points out that the documents captured in Grenada show that the initiative for involving the Cubans and Soviets in Grenadian affairs came from the NJM itself and that no evidence was found of the NJM having been coerced by its allies.

Grabendorff's essay in the Adelman and Reading collection emphasizes the different perspective held by Europeans, who were shocked when the United States made support of its policy in El Salvador a test case for the cohesion of the Western Alliance. He indicates that European perceptions of the Caribbean differ considerably from U.S. perceptions and asserts that the very policies designed to restrict Soviet influence in the region actually help it to spread. Grabendorff perceives a greater need to moderate U.S. policies in the Caribbean.

Two other books by authors not from the United States, those by Edquist and Stone, offer yet another perspective on the Caribbean, one that starts not with the Caribbean Basin concept but with analysis at the level of individual countries. They share several characteristics that al-

low them to develop a more scholarly overview of the problems of change and development in the region than is permitted by a global geostrategic perspective. These two works are useful because they start with historically grounded analyses of the individual societies, then bring together the Hispanic and the non-Hispanic traditions to provide comparative cross-national studies.

Edquist's *Capitalism, Socialism, and Technology* addresses at a microanalytical level a fundamental determinant of economic development—technical change. This analysis is carried out within a carefully constructed comparative framework that examines the relationship between technical change and the type of socioeconomic system. This issue should be of particular interest to scholars and policymakers concerned with the relationship between socialist and nonsocialist approaches to development in the Caribbean. Edquist analyzes the processes of technical change and the determinants and consequences of these processes within the sugar industry in Jamaica and Cuba. The results enhance understanding of the role of appropriate technology in development, and the chosen perspective of cross-system comparisons between capitalist and socialist societies is extremely useful in examining in a nonpolemic manner the effects of ideological diversity on the politics of the region.

One of the most significant recent books on the Caribbean is Carl Stone's *Power in the Caribbean Basin*. This study presents a cross-national comparison of various groups of states within the area referred to as the Caribbean Basin in order to elucidate the factors that determine types of governments and policies. It is the only work discussed here that addresses the question of historical differences in the political economy between Hispanic and non-Hispanic traditions, differences that explain why the Caribbean Basin concept leads to inappropriate attempts to deal with the states of Central America and the Caribbean as a single region.

Stone also criticizes previous studies of the Caribbean focusing on plantation society, arguing that this static approach does not take into account fundamental changes that have occurred in Caribbean societies. His own approach represents a first step toward a systematic comparative framework for analyzing the changing political economy of the region (p. 11). Stone's comparative framework emphasizes management of state power, which yields important data for explaining the complex relationships between economic structures, social systems, political regimes, ideology, and public policy (p. 34).

Although the economies in the Hispanic states of Central America have come to look more like those in the non-Hispanic Caribbean and South American territories, the paradox is that the social system and political regime changes have tended to move in opposite direc-

tions (p. 31). Stone's classification of states into three categories (democratic-pluralist, authoritarian, and populist-statist regimes) allows comparisons between Hispanic and non-Hispanic states in the Caribbean and Central America and facilitates understanding of the reasons why the processes of political change differ in the two groups of states (p. 12).

Ideological pluralism in the region is analyzed according to two distinct models of development, which have similarities but also far-reaching differences. The first model is a basic-needs model of social change, the second, a model of change based on the gradual diffusion of consumer goods or development through the dynamic of marketplace consumerism. The basic-needs model of development is most advanced in Cuba, while the market-consumerist model is most advanced in Barbados and Costa Rica (p. 115). The sense of ideological diversity gained from this perspective diverges markedly from the conclusions resulting from the Caribbean Basin level of analysis.

Stone's approach offers an understanding of the historical differences in political economy among countries of the region, the relationship between these historical differences and sociopolitical structures, and public policies toward development. Recognizing that the United States is more concerned with the foreign policies of the Caribbean and Central American countries than with their domestic policies, Stone suggests that some flexibility exists in the foreign policy alignments of Caribbean Basin countries according to the various development models and the constraints of American geostrategic interests (p. 138).

When viewed from this comparative analytical framework, the revolutions in Grenada and Nicaragua can be understood in a very different light from that usually adopted by the Caribbean Basin perspective. The comparative approach provides a more satisfactory and scholarly understanding of the contemporary sociopolitical realities of Central America and the Caribbean and is more useful as a guide for policymakers concerned with the security and development of the region.

Solutions to problems of security and development are more likely to succeed if they are based on a regional definition grounded in a better understanding of the social and economic conditions of the individual countries of the region rather than on a regional definition based on geostrategic concerns emanating from outside the region. These solutions would be more appropriate for both the security problems of the Caribbean countries and the geostrategic concerns of the United States.

NOTES

1. For example, see Barry, Wood, and Preusch, *The Other Side of Paradise: Foreign Control in the Caribbean*, xiii.

2. J. David Singer, "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations," in *The International System: Theoretical Essays*, edited by Klaus Knorr and Sidney Verba (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 77–92.
3. See Barry, Wood, and Preusch, *The Other Side of Paradise*, xiii.
4. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (London: André Deutsch, 1964).
5. Lloyd Best and Kari Levitt, *Externally Propelled Growth and Industrialization* (Montreal: Centre for Developing Area Studies, McGill University, 1969); Lloyd Best, "A Model of Pure Plantation Economy," *Social and Economic Studies* 17 (1968); and George Beckford, *Persistent Poverty: Underdevelopment in Plantation Economies of the Third World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).
6. Abraham F. Lowenthal, "The Caribbean Basin Initiative: Misplaced Emphasis," *Foreign Policy* 47 (Summer 1982):116.
7. See Adelman and Reading, *Confrontation in the Caribbean Basin*, 3.
8. Edward González, *U.S. Strategic Interests in the Caribbean Basin* (San Germán: Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, 1983), 5.
9. J. Edward Greene, *Perspectives on U.S.–Caribbean Relations in the Mid-Eighties* (San Germán: Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, 1984), 11; and H. Michael Erisman, "Contemporary Challenges Confronting U.S. Caribbean Policy," in *The Caribbean Challenge: U.S. Policy in a Volatile Region*, edited by H. Michael Erisman (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1984), 6.
10. Josefina Cintrón Tiryakian, "The Military and Security Dimensions of U.S. Caribbean Policy," in Erisman, *Caribbean Challenge*, 49.
11. J. Edward Greene, "The Ideological and Idiosyncratic Aspects of U.S.–Caribbean Relations," in Erisman, *Caribbean Challenge*, 43.
12. Commonwealth Consultative Group, *Vulnerability: Small States in the Global Society* (London: Commonwealth Secretariat, 1985).
13. Gerald O. Barney, *The Global 2000 Report to the President of the U.S.: Entering the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Pergamon, 1980).