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Foreword

Six-and-a-half decades ago British statesman Sir Anthony Eden observed: "There’s nothing more dangerous than a foreign policy based on unreality." Among other things, Sir Anthony was admonishing foreign policy makers and practitioners periodically to undertake "reality checks" so that policy and practice can be adapted appropriately. He made the plea in relation to Europe, but the relevance and wisdom of the advice go beyond the confines of Europe.

In this Honors Excellence Occasional Paper Billie Miller provides such a "reality check" in relation to the Caribbean, focusing on issues and actors and the manner in which the region’s policy makers and practitioners protect and pursue the interests of their nations. The Miller "reality check" highlights the centrality of trade and international economic relations in the contemporary foreign policy arena, and the rapidity with which the dynamics of international political and economic relations change. Also, it dramatizes the vulnerability of Caribbean nations to those changing dynamics.

Moreover, Miller identifies some of the challenges and opportunities involved in the pursuit of what she characterizes as a strategy of "defensive reaction" by Caribbean countries. She notes some of the unintended negative consequences of the September 11, 2001 terrorist episode. She suggests, though, that, contrary to the view espoused in some quarters, the dramatic redefinition of foreign and security policy and practice occasioned by that episode notwithstanding, September 11 does not mark the birth of a new era in international relations; it represents a new element in the post-Cold War matrix.

As her biographical note suggests, Billie Miller is eminently qualified to offer this "reality check." She brings a wealth of experience as a local and international actor to her nation’s foreign policy helm, which she has occupied since 1994. Her clarity of thought and exposition also is a demonstration of the sound legal education and experience she has brought to her legislative, civil society, and
ministerial roles. Thus, this foreign policy "reality check" comes not merely from a real-world foreign policy actor but one with a demonstrated capacity to be reflective and contemplative.

Reflection and contemplation are, indeed, envisaged as key features of the Honors Excellence Occasional Papers. The Papers are intended to capture the thoughts of our Honors Excellence Lecture speakers for them to be shared with audiences larger than the ones able to attend the lectures. As an extension of the Lectures, the Papers are intended to add to the corpus of knowledge on subjects that are intrinsically valuable in ideational terms and have practical policy relevance in real-world terms.

I commend this inaugural Excellence Occasional Paper to you in hopes that the "reality check" provided by Billie Miller - initially presented at the inaugural Excellence Lecture on November 26, 2001 - will enhance your knowledge of foreign policy issues and pique your interest in further pursuit of some of them.

Ivelaw L. Griffith, Ph.D.
Dean of The Honors College
Professor of Political Science
“Managing Foreign Policy in an Interdependent World”

INTRODUCTION

The important work which Florida International University is doing in promoting the study of issues relevant to the contemporary Caribbean has not escaped my attention, and I am therefore most grateful to your officials for affording me this opportunity to be with you this evening, to inaugurate the Honors College Excellence Lecture Series. I am especially pleased that you found time in the program you prepared for me to allow for an informal and thoroughly enjoyable visit with faculty members and students earlier today. I welcomed the chance to interact with many of the young minds who will be helping to shape the future of their countries.

The organizers of today's event have suggested that I address you on the topic: "Managing Foreign Policy in an Interdependent World: Challenges and Opportunities." On July 9th, when I first received their suggestion, I thought it was a topic with great potential, which would allow me to treat freely with a number of issues of vital relevance to the external political and economic relations of the contemporary Caribbean. By September 11th, the theme of interdependence had taken on quite another dimension, as unanticipated as it was alarming. As we watched the overnight refashioning of foreign policy priorities in the major capitals of the world and the forging of remarkable new alliances, the concept of successful foreign policy management began to seem like a remote ideal. Two months later, on November 14th, in an international negotiating environment permeated by political uncertainty and economic malaise, the Fourth Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization agreed to the launching of the Doha Development Round of new trade negotiations.

Global Interdependence

To speak of interdependence and foreign policy management in the present circumstances will of necessity therefore require me to take account of the events
of September 11th, and their impact on the shape of relations between and among sovereign states, although not to the exclusion of the many other relevant factors that play a role. It will also require an analysis of the decisions of Doha, and whether these will contribute to enhanced access by developing countries, and small economies in particular, to the benefits of liberalized trade. In discussing the challenges and opportunities I will naturally do so from the only perspective of which I can speak with some authority, that of a small Caribbean state.

Interdependence is not a new concept in international relations. It is certainly not new to the countries of the Caribbean. Trade, capital flows, investment and technology transfer brought about the integration of the Caribbean into the world economy over four centuries ago, and tied its economic fortunes to the prosperity of distant metropolitan centers of power. Small size and openness of economic structures have ensured that it remains connected to this day.

There is no doubt, however, that the concept of global interdependence has gained new relevance and recognition in the latter half of the twentieth century, more especially so since the demise of the Cold War and with it the artificial grouping of countries into communist or capitalist spheres of influence. The number of independent nation states interacting with each other bilaterally or multilaterally has almost quadrupled since 1945, and the complexity of international dialogue, negotiation and decision making has grown enormously. Similarly, the number of issues demanding international attention has increased as has the number of constituencies, at all levels, which seek to influence foreign policy choices.

Information and Communications Technology have shortened the distance between countries, and between their respective citizens, and telescoped the time frame in which strategic information is conveyed and decisions are expected to be taken. There is now enormous public pressure on Governments to produce instant responses to complex international issues of foreign and economic trade policy, a craving, if you will, for sound-bite diplomacy. In his new book, with the intriguing title: *Does America need a Foreign Policy?*, Henry Kissinger puts it most aptly when he observes that the "ubiquitous and clamorous media are transforming foreign policy into a subdivision of public entertainment." Managing foreign policy in this environment is therefore both a science and an art.
The end of the Cold War brought with it high, and, in retrospect, largely unrealistic expectations of a new world order, where it was confidently predicted that the so called "peace dividend" resulting from reduced expenditure on defense would be redeployed to the cause of poverty eradication and economic development, and to the implementation of ambitious global action programs on the environment, social development, population and development, and women's issues.

As we are all only too well aware, the peace dividend never materialized. In effect the vacuum caused by the abrupt disintegration of the east-west balance of power, which had influenced the bilateral relations and multilateral alliances of all states for some forty years, has led instead to a period of intense instability in international affairs. This is not surprising given the enormity and pace of change being assimilated by the international community, precipitated by the fall of the Berlin wall, the crumbling of the Soviet Empire, the disintegration of borders, the defeat of apartheid, and the growing role of civil society in the quest for social justice. We have witnessed the resurgence of brutal ethnic, tribal and religious conflicts in Europe, Africa and Asia; the rise in transnational crime; the realignment of alliances within Europe; a crisis of cohesion and direction in the developing world and its institutional negotiating arms, the Group of 77 (133) and the Non-Aligned Movement, and now of course, the phenomenon of large-scale terrorism. In general, there is now a higher degree of uncertainty and unpredictability in the ordering of international political and social affairs than ever before. Indeed, in some quarters there is even a certain nostalgia for the stable and identifiable parameters of cold war engagement.

In international economic relations the process of negotiating a progressive set of rules to govern the liberalization of international trade has gained momentum in the post-cold war era, fuelled by the ascendancy of free market values as the dominant force in international economic arrangements. At the regional, hemispheric and international levels, new economic blocs and alliances are being formed in response to the irreversible forces of economic globalization.

The evolution and consolidation of a new system of international relations to replace the old is not, however, an overnight phenomenon, but very much still a work in progress. Current trends suggest that it will be firmly based on universal acceptance of three dominant pillars: democratic governance, non-use of military force and free market values. The small countries of the Caribbean
Community are proponents of all three. Caribbean countries constitute the "old democracies" of the region, with a long history of stable democratic governance based on the rule of law and respect for human rights. We have never had a tradition of settling our disputes by means other than dialogue and consultation. For as long as we have been sovereign states we have been committed to free market values. Our integration movement is among the oldest and most successful in the developing world.

TERRORISM AND GLOBAL ORDER

The catastrophic events of September 11th, as reprehensible as they were in their execution and as far reaching in their political and economic consequences, do not in my view signal the coming into being of another new world order, as some have already proclaimed. That new order is already very much in existence, and was brought into being, as we know, by the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War. Rather, they are an extreme example of the ruthless exploitation of the state of flux between the end of one system of international relations, and the consolidation of the other.

The United States of America, as the sole remaining superpower and the dominant force in shaping the political and economic content of that new system, has inspired the envy and hatred of a hard core of fanatics with the apparent means and organization to strike a chilling blow for their warped cause. While we are confident that their efforts will not prevail we recognize the heavy burden on American diplomacy to ensure, in the maturity of its response and in the conduct of its foreign policy, that no new converts to the ways of terror emerge. For as I said in my recent address to the 2001 United Nations General Assembly, it would be an unfortunate irony if the global response to terrorism were conducted in such a manner, through the massive redeployment of resources from other priorities such as the fight against narco-trafficking, extreme poverty, disease and environmental degradation, as to further exacerbate the economic, political and cultural instabilities which are the primary breeding ground for terrorism.

The events of September 11th provide perhaps the most dramatic illustration to date of the extraordinary degree of global economic, political and security interdependence. The rush by countries, including my own, to formulate emergency responses to mitigate the domestic effects of the sudden disruption of the inter-
national political and economic environment, has meant that crisis management is the new order of the day. The overnight reordering of foreign policy imperative in defense of domestic and international security, and the enormous pressure being exerted on all countries to have their anti-terrorism credentials "certified," has large implications for relations between states. The move towards more restrictive border controls and internal regulations will clearly affect the practical application of trade liberalization especially as it relates to the free movement of goods, services and people. There are also discomforting signs that actions currently being taken or contemplated in the name of national security may have the unhappy consequence of severely circumscribing the rights and freedoms of the individual, and adding to the number of innocent victims created by September 11th. All of these developments raise the central question: Is the management of foreign policy in today's interdependent world basically crisis intervention and management in response to rapid and largely unpredictable changes in the international environment? I believe that to a considerable degree this is indeed the case. I also assert that certainly for the Caribbean, and perhaps for most small developing states, with limited resources and the minimum diplomatic infrastructure, this is nothing new, since in our experience crisis management and foreign policy management have long been virtually synonymous.

Small states like Barbados have, by and large, little scope to influence the course of world affairs. We have no hegemonic ambitions to protect, no military industrial complex to sustain, no capacity to affect the supply and demand of any of the world's vital resources. Our principal action is often in fact defensive reaction to external economic or political circumstances not of our own making. It is for this reason that the Prime Minister of Barbados has spearheaded an international campaign, within the Commonwealth, the International Financial Institutions, the FTAA and the WTO, to focus attention on the vulnerability of small states to external shocks. The campaign highlights the urgent need for the international community to embrace a new development paradigm in responding to the challenge of successfully integrating small states into the new global economy.

CENTRALITY OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

For the countries of the Caribbean, managing our foreign policy has always been about ensuring our economic survival and progressive development as small
states in a largely hostile international environment. As such, our foreign policy has been one of consistency and continuity, one which has avoided ideological or other extremes and which has centered on the main priorities of economic development, Caribbean regional integration, social justice and respect for human rights. It has been resilient enough to respond to successive challenges, including the oil crises of the 70's and 80's and the simultaneous intrusion of cold war rivalry into the Caribbean Basin, as well as the global recession of the early 90's. We trust that its resilience will be maintained as we confront the new realities of globalization and the prevailing instability in the world economy.

There is no precedent for the global revolution now facing the community of nations, no tried and true prescription for dealing with its effects. In the words of the Prime Minister of Barbados, the Rt. Hon. Owen Arthur: "the confluence of the special economic and political events of the past decade, and those which are already looming on the horizon, have heralded and will create such a dramatic change in the conduct and ordering of global affairs as to require fundamental and far reaching changes in all societies, large and small. These global changes present special and unique challenges for the Caribbean which go beyond anything it has hitherto had to grapple with in its crisis-ridden history."

For the majority of small developing states, the management of foreign policy in the interdependent world of the 21st Century will centre on efforts to reposition themselves to survive in an intensely competitive global economic environment, stripped of all remaining preferences, and coping with dynamic areas of economic activity generated by the new information age. International trade policy will be at the core of foreign policy, as indeed it has been for centuries past. The greatest and most immediate challenge therefore will be to ensure effective participation, in a number of simultaneous trade negotiations to shape the rules that will govern the market place of the 21st Century.

Perhaps nowhere today is the need for the effective management of foreign policy more evident than in the area of international trade. The work of the World Trade Organization, the premier institution promoting free trade, has drawn attention to the deep divisions which frequently emerge between developing and developed countries, as well as between governments and some sectors of civil society whose interests they are supposed to represent. Indeed reaction to the issues on the WTO negotiating agenda has created some of the uglier scenes of
civic protest experienced by Western countries in recent times. This has encouraged policy makers to recognize the need for meaningful involvement of civil society in the decision-making processes particularly in areas where foreign policy impacts so directly on the lives of their citizens.

But even as the work undertaken in the WTO has highlighted sharp differences, it has also, and to a far greater extent, underscored the growing interdependence of the world economy. This fact, together with the efforts being made by countries across the globe to fashion closer relationships, clearly demonstrates not only the extent to which countries are willing to trade freely, but, perhaps more importantly, the extent to which countries are willing to link their trade policies to those of other countries.

The plethora of agreements and the speed at which new ones are being created is truly breathtaking. The World Trade Organization administers over 28 Agreements, Decisions and Ministerial Declarations coming out of the Uruguay Round alone. That Organization also reports that there are some 150 hemispheric and regional trade agreements in existence today, with an astonishing 100 being created since 1995. Most countries are party to one or more of these agreements which seek to liberalize trade in goods, services or both. The Caribbean itself is in the process of deepening its own economic integration process, known as the Caribbean Community and Common Market, or Caricom. In the early 90's we also expanded our reach to enter into trade agreements with Venezuela and Colombia, and more recently we have negotiated trade agreements with Cuba and the Dominican Republic. The agreement with the Dominican Republic, I am happy to announce, is expected to come into force on December 1st this year.

The scope of the current efforts was further enlarged ten days ago at Doha, when Trade Ministers at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference agreed to launch negotiations in several areas, and to undertake preparations for negotiations in a number of other important areas, among them trade and competition policy, trade and the environment, trade and investment, transparency in government procurement and trade facilitation.

But, in the words of the [Br.] Guardian of November 23rd 2001, the outcome of Doha means that "the unfinished business from the Uruguay Round (Europe and America's heavily protected agriculture and textiles markets), will have to be
tackled as part of the new negotiations, meaning that the developing countries effectively pay twice. In order to get the west to do what it promised the last time, they will have to make more concessions themselves."

All of this activity is being undertaken in the name of free trade which, even as I speak, is being touted as part of the answer to a looming world recession. It is said that free trade will boost world incomes and enable the achievement of higher standards of living. It is also said that consumers will have access to a greater variety of goods and services at cheaper prices, and that, in addition, the best entrepreneurs will be able to use their talents to reach a broader market. Overall, countries will be able to focus their resources on producing the best goods and services they can, thereby stimulating greater levels of employment. While this may well be true in theory, in practice unless the rules of free trade are sensitively fashioned and carefully managed to take account of the enormous disparity in size and level of development among countries, they may have the unfortunate side effect of further increasing the gap between the rich and the poor, and creating the conditions for greater social instability.

HEMISPHERIC AND GLOBAL TRADE DYNAMICS

In the Caribbean, we fully support the trend towards open trade. Most of our countries were founding members of the WTO. At the hemispheric level we are currently engaged in wide-ranging negotiations toward the creation of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, which is meant to come into effect by the year 2005. Of course, as you know, achieving this time frame is heavily dependent on the granting of Trade Promotion Authority by the U.S. Congress, which, we are told, is imminent. We are also simultaneously engaged, under the umbrella of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, the ACP, in the modernization of our economic relations with the European Union.

The history of the Caribbean is one of economic dependence on Europe, which has continued post-independence. The relationship was institutionalized in 1975 with the conclusion of the first Lomé Convention, and its three successor Conventions, under which we have enjoyed one-way preferential trade with Europe. Last year, Barbados and other ACP States signed the Cotonou Agreement, a new and different partnership arrangement, which commits us to negotiating reciprocal trade concessions with the European Union by January,
2008. Cotonou, which brings together the 77 African Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries and 15 (and of course soon to be more) European Union members is the most far-reaching international agreement of its kind, in terms both of its comprehensive nature and of the number of countries it embraces.

Within our own region deepening regional integration through the creation of the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME) is an immediate and urgent priority. I say urgent because the CSME, and indeed all other subregional arrangements, will be subsumed in the FTAA by 2005. Unless the Caribbean Community implements its own single market and economy, encompassing free movement of goods, capital and persons, without further delay it will be unprepared to face the challenges of wider economic integration represented by the FTAA, and the proposed Regional Economic Partnership Agreements with Europe, which must themselves conform to multilateral rules and regulations sponsored by the WTO.

We are not engaged in deepening trade in the various fora because it is fashionable to do so. We are involved because it is critical to our ability to access the global economy. We are committed because we share the vision that there are benefits to be derived from free trade, and from the growing interdependence among our economies. At the same time I must repeat that for this vision to be realized the rules of engagement must be fair and responsive to the circumstances and constraints of the most vulnerable states.

We are all acutely aware that free trade will provide us with greater market access opportunities for our goods, and especially our services. But, we are also acutely aware that preferential arrangements such as the CBI, CARIBCAN and LOME, except in the case of a few commodities, have not lived up to expectations. Even under these preferential arrangements, our exports have encountered many non-tariff barriers which have retarded the growth of our truly competitive industries. For example, preferential trade agreements have not allowed free trade in areas of interest to many of our small states, most notably clothing and textiles.

The passage last year of the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act by the U.S. Congress, after a monumental diplomatic lobbying effort of five years, was welcomed by the countries of the Caribbean Community. The Act, which addresses
the question of NAFTA parity, has contributed to levelling the playing field with Mexico, especially in the area of textiles.

In our region, we are all aware that to survive in a world where preferences are very quickly being eroded, we need to re-engineer our production to become more competitive to meet the demands of full reciprocity. Free trade promises to assist us in this regard, by providing our producers with opportunities to reap the benefits of producing for a larger market. At the same time there is concomitant responsibility on our part to improve our efficiency and competitiveness. It is also essential, however, that trade be not only free but fair.

A related benefit often cited in the context of free trade is that of increasing flows of investment to developing countries. This is certainly one of the most attractive opportunities for countries in the region, which for many years have been witnessing declining levels of Overseas Development Assistance from some of the major developed countries, including the USA, and are increasingly being told that they need to make their way in the world based on their own efforts. Whether free trade will assist us to attract increasing levels of investment or whether we need increasing levels of investment to benefit from free trade is a major question which is still unanswered. As we pursue our commitments to the process of free trade, however, it is vital that the developed world recognize the importance of providing a supportive framework to assist our countries in developing their capacity to make the transition.

For the Caribbean region, a major benefit of trade liberalization is the opportunity it affords us to exploit those services in which we have chosen to develop considerable skill and expertise. I refer in particular to international business, professional, and tourism and hospitality services. We have, as an act of deliberate policy, and in response to the urgings of the developed world to diversify our economies, chosen services as an alternative development strategy, and as the way forward in the new century. Our strategy is not unique, for most countries have done likewise. Ironically, it is these very areas which are now among the most fiercely protected in the developed world. Fairness dictates that our services sector should not also fall victim to the unreasonable market restrictions which our goods have encountered particularly in recent years.

In this regard, we are cautiously optimistic that the confrontational challenge
posed to our financial services regimes by the 1998 OECD Initiative on Harmful Tax Practices is on its way to satisfactory resolution. We fully support the need for careful regulation of the sector to guard against illegal activity, tax crime and money laundering. At the same time, however, we insist that it is the sovereign right of countries to determine their own tax policies. Decisions on international tax matters should only be carried out through an inclusive process that allows for equal participation by all affected parties in the decision-making, and non-discriminatory application of the decisions when made.

The immediacy and extent of the impact of the events of September 11th on tourism, the principal foreign exchange earner for the countries of the Caribbean, is also a cause for concern. We must be vigilant to ensure that the dislocation they have caused to that industry generally is not now used as an excuse to erect new trade barriers and other means of protectionism to erode the competitive advantage which we have built up, by our own effort and without subsidies, over the years.

Let me be clear. We do see opportunities in free trade. If they are to bring tangible results, the developed world must be appreciative of the peculiar challenges faced by the smaller economies. They must be willing to take our concerns into account, especially in the framing of new trade agreements. The impetus to globalization will only be maintained and developed with lasting results when every country, developed or developing, big or small, really believes that it will be better off within the new dispensation. We must all be convinced that we will not be disadvantaged and that the lives of our citizens will get better and not worse. It is therefore important for negotiations to be honest and transparent and to ensure that longer term objectives are not jeopardized in the haste to bring negotiations to a conclusion. Above all, free trade must not become a new instrument of oppression in this new century and new millennium.

**Vulnerability and Challenges**

As small states in the Caribbean we embrace globalization and see its wide possibilities. But we also know the challenges, many of them related to the size of our economies and slenderness of resources. The far-reaching and real-time effects of September 11th, on the economies of the Caribbean states, have provided a dramatic illustration of the extreme fragility and vulnerability of small
states in the international economy. The Joint Commonwealth Secretariat/World Bank Study on *Small States Meeting Challenges in the Global Economy* has lent comprehensive support to the argument that small countries do face peculiar challenges which should be addressed in the international community. There are two major challenges for our small economies. The first relates to making use of export opportunities and the second relates to the competition which our vulnerable firms will face. In order to capitalize on the export opportunities our economies need substantial technical assistance as well as financial resources and they also need access to technologies which will enhance their capacity to overcome the constraints they face. In negotiating international trade agreements our economies require special and differential treatment, particularly longer transitional periods which will allow us to better prepare ourselves for total free trade.

These are among the issues which are informing our foreign policy in relation to trade and which we are seeking to have recognized by international institutions and fully provided for in international trade negotiations. After a concerted lobbying effort of some five years, we have finally gained approval, at Doha, for a work program on smaller economies. While this is a positive first step we must now focus all our energies on persuading other WTO members that the Organization cannot be concerned exclusively with the liberalization of trade, but must also give priority attention to the overall development concerns of all parties.

Our advocacy in respect of small economies has had greater receptivity within the hemisphere, through the Free Trade Area of the Americas process where we have been successful in securing the establishment of a Consultative Group on Smaller Economies as well as a mandate for all the FTAA negotiating groups to consider small economies issues. The specific directives to that effect given in April this year by the 34 Heads of Government of the hemisphere at the III Summit of the Americas in Quebec provide scope for small economies issues to be taken fully into account in all areas of the negotiations towards hemispheric free trade. To that extent our foreign trade policy has been successful.

A troubling issue for all small states in the international arena is the extent to which they remain shut out from the critical stages of the decision making process, which take place behind closed doors and among the exclusive few.
was recently illustrated at the Doha meeting, and, regrettably, continues to be a permanent fixture of the United Nations Security Council, and of the OECD. In this way an unambiguous signal is sent to developing countries that a major focus of their foreign policy must be geared towards getting a fair hearing in the WTO and other major organizations where binding decisions are taken. These are institutions established to foster global interdependence and they must, they simply must find ways of ensuring that all of their members, irrespective of size or level of development, participate as equal partners in the design of the architecture of that interdependence.

The next challenge for our foreign policy strategy is to ensure that tangible outcomes are derived in both the FTAA and WTO negotiations, as well as in our negotiations with the European Union, which are due to commence next year, and where we hope there will also be favorable treatment of small economies issues. In its development priorities, Europe emphasizes assistance to the poorest of the poor. We applaud this. At the same time, however, we as the recently poor are determined not to be returned to the poverty of past centuries. We therefore need positive and supportive policies on the part of our developed country partners to sustain the progress we have made.

A powerful challenge which must not be underestimated in the whole globalization process is the challenge of communication. We must communicate not only with other governments but also with our own citizens. The difficulties which have dogged negotiations at every level clearly show that this new global dynamism and desire for integration needs new structures and processes for reaching consensus. This is so both in the international arena and at the national and subregional levels. The media has an important role to play in this consensus-building process, and it must take its responsibility seriously. While I agree with Dr. Kissinger that vital foreign policy issues are too often trivialized by the media, or subjected to telescoped and flawed analysis in the interest of meeting deadlines and ratings and time slots, at the same time I do not believe that we should accept this as a permanent characteristic. The developing world cannot afford apathy, superficiality or inaccuracy on the part of its media in their role of shaping public opinion. They must become engaged and active partners in the development process. As Governments, we need to help to make them so.

In the past countries have worked successfully to overcome a number of interna-
tional challenges and non-trade non-military threats in a whole range of areas including health, especially HIV/AIDS, education, and natural disasters. And terrorism as well. Today we are working to enhance world security. Why should we not also be working towards trading systems which address many of the critical issues facing developing countries including food security, poverty and other social ills.

BILATERAL LINKAGES

I have talked extensively about foreign policy management in the context of our multilateral trade obligations. Interdependence must, however, of necessity, also have a direct bearing on our bilateral relations.

In that regard, the first challenge to which the Caribbean must respond is how to make the transition from our historical and by now instinctive gravitation towards our northern axis partners, the former colonial powers, to a foreign policy that concentrates on building relations with new and non-traditional allies, particularly our southern neighbors in this hemisphere. History, culture and language have divided the Caribbean Community from its Latin neighbors. The advent of the FTAA will make it essential that we develop a greater level of interaction with and understanding of the countries of Latin America. Much of Barbados' future diplomatic outreach will be devoted towards enhancing this important relationship. The introduction of Spanish as the official second language in our schools is part of this strategy. So too is our emphasis on developing the Association of Caribbean States as the bridge towards this future.

We must also give priority attention to the forging of a more modern and mature relationship with our traditional developed country partners, one that moves us from the past age of dependence and preferences, to a liberalized era based on trade, investment and services. Our centuries-old ties with Canada have flourished in the post-independence years, and it remains a close ally with which we have had a structured consultative process, at the highest political level, for well over twenty years. Caricom Heads of Government met in Summit session with Prime Minister Chrétien as recently as January this year.

The Heads also engaged Prime Minister Tony Blair in July, and they agreed to define a new agenda for UK/Caribbean cooperation. A Task Force established to
prepare the preliminary ground will submit its report to the Heads when they meet in March next year. Britain’s role in the new Europe, and the place of the Caribbean in the development policies of the EU are factors which will influence the shape of the relationship in the future. Encounters have also been held with the President of France and the Prime Minister of Spain on ways of enhancing their relations with the English-speaking Caribbean and, in the case of France, strengthening the functional and economic cooperation between Caricom and the French overseas territories in the region.

But the relationship which is clearly of greatest interest to you, and the most critical for us, is that which the Caribbean shares with the United States of America, our major trading partner. This too is of several centuries’ duration and has matured and prospered over time. While there have been periodic irritants and tensions, I think that on balance the relationship has been strong and constant.

As I have said on other occasions, we in the English-speaking Caribbean consider ourselves to be good and productive neighbors of the United States. And as good neighbors we must all do our part to keep our neighborhood secure, stable and successful. We have put in place, through the 1997 Bridgetown Partnership for Prosperity and Security in the Caribbean, a positive mechanism for dialogue and consultation on a range of economic, trade, environmental, and justice and security issues of mutual concern, and we look forward to developing strong and mutually supportive relations with the Bush Administration, and following up on the preliminary meetings we have already held with President Bush and Secretary Powell. We fully understand that other pressing priorities will have an effect on the timetable for the more in-depth dialogue which we had hoped to initiate with Secretary Powell earlier this year, and are anxiously awaiting the opportunity to consult further with him on developing the proposed Third Border Initiative into a truly meaningful program for both parties.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

It has often been stated that the best managers are those who could make the best decisions on the least information. Those who procrastinate have the decisions made for them by the passage of time and therefore have no real control over the outcome.

Similarly, successful foreign policy in an interdependent world will depend more and more on the ability to analyze current information better and more rapidly than the competitors, project more insightfully into the future and position our countries to take advantage of the opportunities that were not foreseen by the less astute.

The levelling effect of information technology for the first time affords small countries a real chance to enhance our competitive position in the international arena. Our main priority must be the development of their human resources to seize that opportunity and utilize it to maximum benefit. I believe that we are up to the challenge.

We may not be able to complete the task, but neither are we at liberty to abstain from it.
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The Honors College

The Honors College at Florida International University is a small community of outstanding students, dedicated scholars, and committed teachers who work together in an atmosphere usually associated with small private colleges. Yet, they do so with all the resources of a major state university, which is one of the nation's top doctoral/research extensive universities. Only 152 universities in the United States hold this superior rank.

The undergraduate experience provided by the college is significantly enhanced by the broad transdisciplinary nature of the curriculum and opportunities to work closely with expert faculty and in the community. The opportunities for graduate or professional study and for employment are greatly expanded because of the range of unique activities and academic experiences made available to students in the College. Students may pursue almost any major available in the University and at the same time complete the Honors curriculum.

All classes are interdisciplinary and most are team-taught. Years I and II are structured similarly: students and faculty at each level meet in a large group session one day each week for activities such as lectures, panel discussions, case studies, and student presentations; the other class meeting each week is spent in small group preceptorials. Professors meet with the same small group throughout the year. Senior seminars meet as independent classes with an emphasis on synthesizing the students' experiences during the previous two years and introducing them to graduate level research activities, among other things.

The curriculum emphasizes the following activities:

- Critical, integrative, and creative thinking;
- Group and independent research;
- Oral presentation;
- Close contact between students and faculty;
- Integration of class work with the broader community.

The College brings together professors of different disciplines not so much to present a catalog of competing worldviews as to offer faculty and students the opportunity to answer the big questions all humans face. Year I asks: "Where did we come from?"; year II, "Who are we?"; year III, "What is worthwhile?"; year IV, "Where are we going?" The paths followed are transdisciplinary, going beyond the traditional divisions of intellectual activity to encompass the differ-
ent facets of human thought and human creativity. Unity in diversity is the model for our students, our faculty, and our academic program.

Carefully selected from the more than 1,400 faculty members at the University for their accomplishments as both teachers and scholars, members of the Honors faculty take great pride in their close association with their students and are committed to excellence.

The Honors Place at Florida International University is a dedicated wing of Panther Hall designed to provide Honors College students with special programming, student mentoring, social events, service learning projects and the convenience of being advised and taking courses in the same place. The unique curriculum of the College promotes learning outside of the classroom. The Honors Place living arrangement accommodates access to Honors College colleagues and fosters academic and social exchange among project partners.

The Honors College currently offers three study abroad programs to its students in the summer; one to Spain, one to Italy, and a new program to the Caribbean. The Spain program incorporates Madrid, Santiago de Compostela, and Barcelona in its itinerary. This program offers students the opportunity to experience international travel while pursuing a rigorous academic program integrated with the Honors curriculum. The Italy Program is also a four week interdisciplinary study-travel experience. It takes participants to four cities as centers of investigation in this academic tour. They are Rome, Florence, Sorrento, and Padua/Venice. In the Caribbean Program students experience the physical environments of Caribbean countries and learn how the interactive role of the geologic or environmental setting of the region has played a significant role in its history, and the blend of European, African, Asian and Taino cultures.

The Honors College Pre-Collegiate Summer Institute at Florida International University offers high school students the exciting opportunity to attend college classes during the summer prior to their senior year in high school. Hosted at University Park, the Honors College Pre-Collegiate Summer Institute is highly competitive. A limited number of academically talented students are accepted annually into the program. All students take one class together: Modes of Inquiry, ENG 2001. This course provides an introduction to the diverse ways in which people and groups view the world, and the different means of investigating those views. Students also select a second course from virtually any area appropriate to their interests and needs.