

**Coca eradication and Alternative Development in the
Chapare: Transnational diffusion of the U.S. norms
development and democracy**

Name: Marliese Vollebregt
Student number: S1209574
Tutor: Dr. Michelle Carmody
Date: 22 May 2015
Words: 10953

Table of contents

Introduction	3
1. U.S. foreign policy in Latin America and the War on Drugs	10
2. Acts and laws concerning U.S. foreign policy and drug control	16
3. The Chapare Regional Development Project: Paper, Evaluations and Reports	21
Conclusion	30
Bibliography	32

Note to the reader: in this thesis MLA citation style has been used.

Introduction

U.S. foreign policies have been focused on Latin America since the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 and have always been present ever since. During the 1970s and 1980s a main focus of U.S. foreign policy has been the War on Drugs. Coca eradication in the Andean countries was one of the programs to attack the drug problem at the source. The Chapare region in Bolivia was one of the areas where coca eradication influenced by the United States occurred. Furthermore, coca eradication programs and alternative development projects, such as crop substitution, were founded and funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). These programs have their origins in the Alliance for Progress policy and the Foreign Assistance Act both enacted in 1961 and formed the basis for U.S. ideology of assisting developing countries in order to make progress and move forward. The U.S. ideology behind foreign policy consists of the obligation that the United States assumes to have of helping developing countries to transfer into developed countries. The two main norms that drive this ideology are democracy and development. The idea of progress and assistance become clear through the transnational diffusion of the U.S. ideology and more specifically through their norms. The concepts of development and democracy are broad and vague, therefore this thesis makes use of the specific case study of coca eradication and alternative development the Chapare region to illustrate how democracy and development have been diffused by the United States through their foreign drug policy. First of all, an overview of related and relevant literature will be outlined. Then a section on transnational methodology will follow. The final part of this introduction consists of an outline of the theoretical framework that will be used throughout this thesis.

The foreign drug policies can be seen as an approach to diffuse U.S. values, norms and ideologies. However drug policies had not been the only practice to maintain power and influence in the region. U.S. foreign policies in general have been widely critiqued, as well as the effectiveness of the specific coca elimination programs in the Chapare in Bolivia. Furthermore, the modernization and economic development in Bolivia has been heavily debated. These three main issues will be discussed in the section below; within each school of thought the most important authors and perspectives will be exposed.

First of all, the first body of literature consists of a group of scholars criticizing U.S. foreign policy in general. W. Appleman Williams summarizes U.S. foreign policy as ‘The Tragedy of American Diplomacy’, according to him, U.S. foreign policies only produced more severe crises abroad. He takes the Cuban crisis as an example, which should never have happened if U.S. policy had been more successful (Williams, 1961: 6). The main problem is that the American policies are guided by the idea that other states cannot solve their own problems unless the United States helps out and makes sure that countries follow their path (Williams, 1961: 9). This idea is based in the time of the American Revolutionaries when they thought of themselves as an empire, which led to non-colonial imperial expansion in the twentieth century, mainly in Latin America. Matthew Brown continues with the concept of the ‘informal empire’ in Latin America and describes the United States as a hegemonic power in the region, which shows similarities with colonialism and imperialism, mainly facilitated by the asymmetry of power (Brown, 2008: 230). Eldon Kenworthy referenced to colonialism when discussing U.S. foreign policies in Latin America, due to the fact that the United States uses the policies to unify Latin America in a way that had been used to pull colonies together (Kenworthy, 1995: xii). Joseph Figueiredo critiques the U.S. neoliberal policies in order to promote economic development and stable democracy. Latin America has been considered to be part of the sphere of influence and good relations with the region is a goal of the U.S. foreign policies, however the opposite effect has been achieved (Figueiredo, 2007: 697). The unilateral interventionist policies did not work out, and according to Figueiredo it is time for a change. In conclusion, all the scholars mentioned above agree that U.S. foreign policy have been often unnecessary, unsuccessful and ineffective.

Whereas the scholars above perceive U.S. policy in general negatively, the following group of scholars is especially hostile toward the coca eradication, crop substitution and alternative development programs as part of the U.S. War on Drugs in the Chapare in Bolivia; this area will form the research focus of this thesis. Jon Hellin has studied this region, and from his article lessons from the Bolivian case can be learned. He evaluated coca eradication as successful, because coca was officially eradicated from the Chapare in 2009. On the other hand, the results of alternative

development, usually in the form of crop substitution, are questionable. The crop substitution and alternative development have failed to provide a sufficient income for former coca farmers (Hellin, 2010: 139). Farthing & Kohl agree with the fact that the United States has been ignoring the negative impacts of the coca eradication and the failure of the Alternative Development, accordingly the U.S should work with rather than against the coca farmers in the Chapare, in order to provide successful economic development as well as the reduction of coca production (Farthing & Kohl, 2005: 194-195). Furthermore, Hallums describes the Bolivian point of view by mentioning that Ley 1008, essential part of legislation is backing up U.S. foreign drug policy, has been referred to as the 'Ley de Extranjeros', which emphasizes the disagreement with the U.S. involvement and influence in the region, because the farmers of the Chapare did not agree neither wanted coca eradication to occur (Hallums, 1997: 835). The failure of the U.S. policy and the discontentment of the Chapare farmers are partly rooted in the militarization of the coca eradication. Bruce Bagley has written on the use of armed forces in the War on Drugs. According to him military intervention in the Chapare were evaluated only partially and temporarily successful. In the end, U.S. military involvement in coca eradication in the Chapare has been controversial, unsustainable and counter-productive (Bagley, 1992: 135-136). A better solution would have been indirect and long-term cooperation, since it would have created less hostility against the United States and would probably be more productive according to all the above scholars.

According to the scholars' evaluation on the effectiveness of the coca eradication and crop substitution programs in the Chapare, the alternative development part of the programs failed. The third group of scholars discusses the difficulty of development, in particular in Bolivia. Elena Alvarez argues that economic development in general is usually not 'smooth process', furthermore restructuring an economy in order to make it more modern and open usually entails high economic costs (Alvarez, 1995: 125). Tsolakis views the social restructuring in Bolivia since 1985 as part of a transnational development process since 1970s (Tsolakis, 2009: 2). Rather than taking a national or international perspective, Annelies Zoomers has researched development in relation to the Bolivian Andes and, in particular, the farmers. Despite the national and international development

programs in the Bolivian Andes, the lives of the farmers hardly improved (Zoomers, 1999: 11). There are several reasons why development programs usually fail in rural areas, however the most striking argument put forward by Zoomers is that development programs are usually build on ‘western notions of development’ (Zoomers, 1999: 11). The lack of understanding or misinterpretation of the farmers lives might lead to incoherent policies and programs, which does not comply to reality and therefore will not lead to the desired result. Due to the fact that the agriculture sector in Bolivia usually does not profit from development programs, Howard Conklin wrote suggestions for the development of the agriculture in Bolivia. His two main suggestions are the improvement of transportation and the strengthening of local governments (Conklin, 1987: 18-19). This final group of scholars agrees that development in Bolivia is a difficult process, which did not really succeeded yet. Development has been a vital norm in U.S. foreign policy, however the way in which the United States assists developing countries has been contested, and the need for development aid.

The groups of scholars discussed above, especially in relation to the Latin American region, perceive U.S. foreign policies negatively. The negative evaluation of the effectiveness of the coca eradication, crops substitution and alternative development programs in the Chapare comply with the overall critique of U.S. foreign policy. For the purpose of this thesis, I will not go into the debate whether the U.S. foreign drug policies were successful or not as has been done by many scholars already. I will rather take a transnational approach to this topic, since foreign polices are inherently transnational as they transcend national borders. The purpose of this thesis is to evaluate the diffusion of the most important U.S. norms of development and democracy by using the coca eradication and alternative development programs in the Chapare as a case study. In the following section transnationalism and the transnational approach will be briefly outlined, followed by the theoretical framework based on transnational diffusion.

Transnationalism as a methodology does not only mean across or beyond nation-states, but looking at a world without national borders. According to Khagram and Levitt, ‘social life crosses, transcends and sometimes transforms borders and

boundaries in many different ways' (2008:1). The key component of a transnational approach is 'to interrogate the territorial breadth and scope of any social phenomenon without prior assumptions' (Khagram and Levitt, 2008: 5). This transnational studies approach taken by Khagram and Levitt is a recent development. As Tyrell describes in his article 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History', historiography used to be based on nation-states and on comparative history by emphasizing national differences between nation-states. However 'states are by no means the only actors in world politics' (Nye & Keohane, 2008: 23), this does not include the ignorance of the nation-state and nationalism, yet different geographical scales (regional, national, transnational) should be taken into account (Tyrell, 1991: 1033). Therefore an alternative to the national focus should be taken into account: transnational history. This alternative approach is relevant to this thesis.

Firstly, Tyrell discusses regional analysis or approach. This concept can be applied to the case study, since drugs problems do not only affect Bolivia, yet also all drug trafficking is a problem to all countries in the region (Hallums, 1997: 861). Related to this regional approach is the world systems theory of Immanuel Wallerstein, which combines local conditions and transnational influences into one broad theory. It is about the core versus the periphery and consequently its trading interdependence. When we are talking about core and periphery, we are talking about 'an unequal exchange between the products' (Wallerstein, 1982: 92). The core-type and peripheral type activities are unequally geographically distributed (Wallerstein, 1982: 93) On the one hand the U.S. reliance on Third World countries for raw materials, on the other hand, the Third World countries rely on the U.S. for economic and development aid (Tyrell, 1991: 1042). According to Youngers, the interdependent relationship between the United States and the periphery, can be explained by the fact that due to the dependence on economic aid and desire for trade agreements the countries find themselves obliged to adopt U.S. policies and programs (2005: 340). The interdependent relationship between the United States and Bolivia is of great importance in analyzing the U.S. foreign drug policy in the Chapare region. In conclusion, nation-states remain important in the fields of history and politics, yet both domestic and international forces are shaping state power and should therefore be taken into account. According to Tyrell, in this age of international history,

historiography should transcend national boundaries and focus on global relations (Tyrell, 1991: 1055). Thus in this more globalizing and international world, we have to change from a nation-state to a transnational perspective. With regard to U.S. foreign drug policy, interdependence and transnational policy diffusion are key concepts.

When using a transnational perspective to the U.S. foreign drug policy and the programs of coca eradication and alternative development programs in the Chapare, transnational diffusion forms a suitable theoretical framework to approach the topic and look at the diffusion of U.S. ideas and norms through the policies and programs. Transnational diffusion is a consequence of interdependence according to Gilardi and means that decisions in one country depend not only on domestic factors and international pressures, but also on decisions made in other countries (Gilardi, 2012: 31). Transnational diffusion in the way that Gilardi perceives it is international policy diffusion, which occurs when government policy decisions in a given country are systematically conditioned by prior policy choices made in other countries (Gilardi, 2012: 2). Transnational diffusion is a process that can lead to policy adoption (Gilardi, 2012: 3), thus one policy has been designed in a country and then later on adopted in another country. When applying this concept to the case of the coca elimination in the Chapare, the ideas, norms and policies of the United States affected the decisions made in Bolivia, with Ley 1008, which will be discussed later on, as the most striking example.

The main norms the United States have tried to diffuse as will become clearer in the following chapters are development and democracy. Development and democracy construct the U.S. foreign 'policy paradigm' (Gilardi, 2012: 7), which is a framework of ideas and norms. Although the main aim of the coca eradication is to eliminate coca production, the policies are also aiming at alternative development, for example in the form of crop substitution, to develop and diversify the Bolivian economy in order to generate economic growth. Besides development promotion, democracy promotion stood at the core of U.S. foreign policy as will be discussed in following chapters. Gilardi distinguishes four ways of transnational diffusion: coercion, competition, learning and emulation. In the case of the Chapare, coercion applies best,

since '[c]oercion is the imposition of a policy by powerful international organizations or countries' (Gilardi, 2012: 13). The United States is a more powerful country than Bolivia and was able to influence the domestic Bolivian politics with their foreign drug policy due to political and economic power. In order to affect policies, one needs to gain access to political system of target-state, in this case Bolivia and furthermore one needs to generate or contribute to winning a policy coalition in order to change decisions in the desired direction (Risse-Kappen, 2008: 466). The United States gained access to the Bolivian political system and was able to influence policies mostly by using economic instruments such as USAID, Inter-American Development Bank and trade threats. Transnational diffusion is related to the third way of transnational history analysis by Tyrell, as mentioned before, which is the study of organizations, movements and ideologies, since it transcends national boundaries and focus on the global relations.

The body part of the thesis is structured as follows: in the first chapter a historical background from U.S. foreign policy in Latin America in general and the coca eradication programs in the Chapare in specific will be described. In the second and third chapters the case study of the Chapare will be discussed in greater detail by examining policies, programs and laws. Finally, the influence of the United States and its diffusion of ideas, norms and values by executing the foreign policy in the Chapare will be evaluated.

1. U.S. foreign policy in Latin America and the War on Drugs

The U.S. ideology of developing and democratizing Latin America has been used to legitimize their foreign policies and actions to protect their own economic and security interests. This chapter will provide a historical background on U.S. foreign policy in Latin America and will illustrate the main objectives of U.S. foreign policies by discussing four broad U.S. foreign policies toward Latin America in chronological order: The Monroe Doctrine, The Inter-American Cooperation, The Good Neighbor Policy and The Alliance for Progress. Afterwards, a policy known as the War on Drugs will be discussed in more detail. Finally the coca eradication and crop substitution programs in the Chapare region in Bolivia will be examined as examples of particular programs of the War on Drugs.

The history of U.S. foreign policies with respect to Latin America started at the beginning of the nineteenth century during the wars for independence in Spanish colonies in 1810 (Schmitt, 1968: 34). The Monroe Doctrine was formulated in 1823 and stated that the United States was opposing to any further European colonization or extension of European political systems to the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore the United States will treat the existing European colonies in the Americas with respect and will protect the countries from interference and colonization from outside the region (Schmitt, 1968: 34). Another important feature of the Doctrine was its unilateral character, thus it was not an agreement with the Latin American nation-states, only a U.S. policy focused on the whole Western Hemisphere. At the end of the nineteenth century U.S. foreign policies changed from unilateral to limited cooperation. This broad policy is known as Inter-American Cooperation. This cooperation was partly needed to prevent war in the hemisphere, however U.S. economic interests played, perhaps, an even larger role, due to the increase of U.S. economic power and the need for markets abroad. However, within international cooperative politics to promote trade and peace, the United States used its military superiority to invade several Caribbean countries. As a result the Latin American countries perceived their neighbor as 'a more dangerous threat to their sovereignty and independence than the European power against whom the United States was allegedly protecting them' (Schmitt, 1968: 36). The Roosevelt Administration implemented the third broad policy in 1936 under the name 'Good Neighbor Policy',

which was mainly based on the commitment of the United States to nonintervention in Latin America in order to create a good feeling between the Northern and Southern part of the Western Hemisphere (Schmitt, 1968: 36). After the First World War the United States became the dominant commercial and military power, yet the unilateral security policy was abandoned and several arrangements were made between the United States and the rest of the Western Hemisphere. Nonetheless the Good Neighbor Era did not last long due to the aftermath of the Second World War in which the greatest concern and fear of the United States was the spread of communism to their backyard. During the Cold War the foreign policy returned to its origins: the Monroe Doctrine. Usually the intervention of the United States in Guatemala in 1954 marks the end of the Good Neighbor Policy (Schmitt 1968: 37). The fourth broad foreign policy towards Latin America is known as 'The Alliance for Progress', which was outlined by President Kennedy in 1961 (Schmitt 1968: 40). The philosophy of this alliance was cooperation among all states of Latin America and the United States in order to reach economic development, cultural progress, political freedom and social reform by supplying capital and technical skills from the United States. This policy is expressed in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which is discussed in the latter of this thesis. This act laid the foundation for U.S. influence in Latin America, mainly focusing on democracy and development promotion.

War on Drugs

Along with the promotion of democracy and development in Latin America, during the 1970s a new idea was added to U.S. foreign policy: drug control. During the Cold War a new problem occurred: the illicit drug trade expanded internationally and became a global phenomenon and global problem (Leon, 2003: 1). Within the United States, cocaine use was spreading quickly into the middle class. Drug abuse among U.S. citizens in the early 1980s remained at dangerously high levels (DEA, 1985: 44). Due to 'the invisible hand of supply and demand, with Latin American governments finding it difficult to control supply and the U.S. governments finding it difficult to control demand' (Schultz, 1998: 367), The United States developed foreign rather than domestic policies to control the coca problem. The expanding cocaine trade during the 1980s in the Western Hemisphere reengaged the United States in Latin America politics (Pastor, 2001: 75). The 'War on Drugs', one of the

U.S. foreign policies focusing on Latin America, was initiated in 1972 when President Nixon declared drugs the public enemy number one. He wanted to eliminate drugs 'to purify the American society' (Leon, 2003: 61). The War on Drugs was really handled as a war, as Reagan stated that 'we can fight the drug problem and we can win' (Leon, 2003: 68). The main focus of the War on Drugs since the 1980s has been the supply-side strategy of the suppression drugs (Santos, 2002: 129), by increasing expenditures as well as military involvement in the Andean region in order to address the problem at the source (Pastor, 2001: 102). The Reagan administration viewed the American society as helpless victims of the evil Latin American drug traffickers (Leon, 2003: 65). This point of view put the emphasis on foreign drug policy rather than domestic policy. The federal costs on supply-side strategy policies increased enormously from \$437 million per year during the 1970s to 1.4 billion during the Reagan years 1981-1986, whereas the spending on domestic treatment and prevention programs declined from \$2000 million 1982 to \$126 million in 1986 (Leon, 2003: 69). In 1986 drug trafficking was labeled a threat to U.S. national security.

Although the United States pictured themselves as the victims of the drug production in Latin America, the United States was the country with the highest drug demand in the world. Due to the dominant position of the United States in the international system, the drug producing countries in Latin America were willing to cooperate in the U.S. War on Drugs (Leon, 2003: 89). As mentioned before, security is key in foreign policy and furthermore economic, political, social, cultural and territorial interests played an important role. The United States needed to use their dominant position and power in order to maintain their needs and interests in Latin America. The War on Drugs and the supply-side strategies in Latin America can be seen as an example to use power and preserve influence. The threat of sanctions and military use has been used to demonstrate power and domination, which exposes the unequal power relations between the United States and the drug producing countries. Finally, the United States threatened to use trade sanctions if countries did not cooperate in the elimination of drug production, processing and trafficking. This can be seen as an example of how the United States made use of coercion in transnational policy diffusion, as discussed in the theoretical framework. With the foreign U.S. drug policies in Latin America, the United States continued the promotion of

economic development and political democracy, which was emphasized by the Alliance of Progress policy of 1961 and will be discussed into more detail in the following chapter. First an historical overview of U.S. foreign drug control in the Chapare in Bolivia will be provided.

Drug control in the Chapare

One of the major strategies of the U.S. War on Drugs was to eliminate the drug production and processing in Latin America, known as ‘source control’ (Leichtman, 2000: 64). Part of the source control was the coca eradication and crop substitution programs and the development of economic alternatives for the coca farmers in Andean regions. Bolivia is one of the world’s leading producers of coca and therefore became a “major enemy” of the American War on Drugs (Santos, 2002: 129). Coca production in Bolivia is concentrated in two areas, the Yungas and the Chapare. The Yungas, northeast of La Paz, is the oldest area of production in Bolivia. The Chapare is situated in the northeast of the Cochabamba department. The Chapare region has moderate slopes and huge rivers, temperatures are tropical and the precipitation levels are high, thus the conditions are perfect for growing coca (UNODC, 2007: 37). The Chapare is a newer producing region in Bolivia, but in terms of volume it is now the most important region of the country (South, 1997: 24). In the Chapare 92.5 percent of the total agricultural production is coca (Machicado, 1992: 88), as the land and climate in the Chapare is suitable for the cultivation of coca (Farthing & Kohl, 2005: 184). In Bolivia there has been a major increase in coca production since 1975, on the one hand caused by the increasing international demand, on the other hand by the political and economic crisis in Bolivia. The cultivation of coca was popular amongst the poor farmers of the Chapare, due to the fact that coca does not require fertilizer, it suffers few pest problems, it thrives in impoverished soils, it can be harvested three or four times a year, it is easy to transport and despite price fluctuations it can bring in a good reliable income (Hellin, 2010: 141). Coca production and processing has a major economic impact in Bolivia and in the Chapare region in particular. In 1989, 364,715 people were employed in the total coca-cocaine cycle in Bolivia, of which 201,275 people were working in the Chapare region (Machicado, 1992: 91). Due to the extensive coca production in the Chapare it was chosen as a region for the implementation of source control policies, including coca eradication.

Therefore the extensive coca production in the Chapare region led to coca eradication policies, which included destroying hectares and hectares of coca plants. Due to the extensive eradication, the Chapare was also regarded as a logical place to implement crop substitution programs to replace coca with other crops in order to provide the farmers with alternative incomes (Lee, 1986: 143). The United States Assistance for International Development ('USAID') founded and monitored the programs and The Inter-American Development Bank financed programs in the target countries of the U.S. foreign drug policy. For example, in 1994 an \$80 million education project in Bolivia was established in order to improve the skilled manpower in the country. The U.S. Andean Strategy consisted on three areas: law enforcement, crop eradication and economics assistance (Hallums, 1997: 845-846). In this manner the United States incorporated the Andean countries into their War on Drugs by enforcing laws, eradicating coca and supplying economic assistance for alternative development. The two most important Bolivian laws will be briefly discussed here and then in more detail in the next chapter. In 1988, Ley 1008 was adopted which distinguished legal and illegal coca. The legal coca was the coca cultivated in the Yungas, which was mainly used for traditional and medicinal purposes, while the commercialized coca of the Chapare was declared illegal. The law allowed the police and military to fight the coca production as well as the cocaine trade (Farthing & Kohl, 2005: 187) and adding to this, the illegal type of coca had to be eradicated. The eradication programs worked along side alternative development initiatives or, in other words, crop substitution programs. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) funded most of these initiatives. However the funding from USAID was only supplied to those countries that were actively participating in the eradication of coca. Furthermore, the crop substitution programs needed to be continued as it were seen as the only way of alternative development in the Chapare. Species including banana, pineapple, palm heart, passion fruit and black pepper were found suitable to the Chapare (Hellin, 2010: 143).

Coca as part of Bolivian culture and tradition

However, it is important to mention that coca production in Bolivia was not only aiming at export nor economic gains, yet coca leaves have a traditional value in the

country. Coca is part of Bolivian identity, since the coca leaf stands for the continuity and coherence of key concepts, such as sovereignty, nation and indigenesness (Grisaffi, 2010: 427). The coca leaf is used as a nationalist symbol. Furthermore there is an ethnic connotation to the plant, because the coca growers attain their indigenous status from the coca leaf as part of their identity. Besides a marker of identity, chewing coca is a social activity in the Chapare communities (Grisaffi, 2010: 430). Whereas coca plants for export are used to produce cocaine, the Bolivians use the coca leaves for other purposes; it can be chewed or prepared as a tea and is used to overcome fatigue, hunger and thirst (Grisaffi, 2010: 429). Coca can be used for ritual and medicinal purposes. According to Grisaffi, coca in the Chapare has cultural as well as social significance, since coca chewing is a social act. The current president of Bolivia, Evo Morales, used to be a coca farmer and then became the leader of the lowland coca growers union (Farthing & Kohl, 2013: 363). Now he is the national indigenous leader, which emphasizes the importance of indigenous culture and tradition as well as coca farming within the country. When comparing the U.S. War on Drugs with the Bolivian tradition of coca, one can clearly see the development of a clash of values. From the point of view of The United States, coca is evil and something that threatens their national security as well as national health and therefore should be eradicated. Furthermore they believe that the coca production hinders Bolivian economic development and in order to facilitate progress, the economy should rely on other crops than coca. On the other hand, the coca leaf has traditional, cultural and social value for the Bolivia and is embedded in their culture and practices. This clash of values clearly marks the difference in norms and values between the two countries concerning this issue.

To conclude, there has been a long history of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America, with a special focus on the elimination of drug production, procession and trafficking during the 1980s and 1990s. The coca eradication and crop substitution programs in the Chapare in Bolivia are an example of the War on Drugs put into practice. There is a clear clash of values concerning coca between the United States and Bolivia. In Chapter 2 the acts and laws concerning U.S. foreign policy and drug control will be discussed. Furthermore, in Chapter 3 the USAID Project Paper of the Chapare, the evaluations of the project and USAID and UN reports will be outline

2. Acts and laws concerning U.S. foreign policy and drug control

In Chapter 1, the history of U.S. foreign policy has been briefly outlined and the case of the Chapare region in Bolivia introduced. In this chapter the general laws and acts on foreign policy, international development and drugs control that facilitated the policies and programs in the Chapare will be discussed. Although the coca eradication programs and the alternative development in the Chapare took place during the 1980s and 1990s, the foundations for these policies were already laid in 1961 with the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act and the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, which facilitated for example Ley 1008 in 1988 which distinguished between legal and illegal coca in Bolivia. These three documents will be discussed in this chapter.

Foreign Assistance Act and Alliance for Progress 1961

First of all, The Foreign Assistance Act was enacted and signed by President John F. Kennedy in 1961, which was supplementary to the ‘Alliance for Progress’ policy developed in the same year. The first part of the act was titled ‘The Act for International Development’ and sets the scene and explains the U.S. ideology on foreign policy and assistance. The ideology of the United States was the desire to create ‘a worldwide atmosphere of freedom’ and according to the U.S. it is their responsibility to provide assistance to less developed countries (FAA, 1961: 2). The two fundamental U.S. norms are democracy and development. The spreading of political democracy and economic growth was necessary in order to ensure worldwide atmosphere of freedom, which will ensure the survival of U.S. liberty, democracy and free institutions. With this Foreign Assistance Act, U.S. foreign policy will made assistance available in order to provide security and maintain peace and freedom worldwide (FAA, 1961: 3). The U.S. contributed to economic development, mainly in developing countries, with the supply of plans and programs.

In relation to this Foreign Assistance Act and with regard to Latin America, the United States developed the Alliance for Progress also in 1961, the four broad foreign policy as discussed in the previous chapter, which included a cooperation within the Western Hemisphere and also aimed to promote economic development and political democracy. The assistance provided by the U.S. was in different forms. First of all, a

Development Loan Fund, furthermore development grants and technical cooperation, finally loans to small farmers and investment opportunities in developing countries. All these financial forms were aiming at the economic development and indirectly at political democracy, since it is believed that these two concepts go hand in hand. Within the Foreign Assistance Act special attention has been given to Latin America, since the U.S. promises ‘assistance in the development of Latin America’ (FAA, 1961: 37), economic assistance as well as military assistance. The relationship between the United States and Latin America was, and still is, interdependent as well as unequal, within the world system, the U.S. can be considered to be part of the core, whereas Latin America is regarded as a peripheral region, which has resulted in these policies in which the United States diffuses its norms, ideologies and influence. Throughout the whole act a strong emphasis on development and democracy can be seen. These two concepts seem to be the two main norms of the United States and are considered to be of great relevance in foreign policy and worldwide promotion of peace.

Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

In the same year, the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs was signed by seventy-three states. The adoption of the Convention on March 25, 1961, marked the completion of an international work that started in 1948. In that year, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs adopted a resolution, which was introduced by the representative of the United States (Lande, 1962: 776). This implies the influence and input of the U.S. in this international convention on Narcotic Drugs. The 1961 convention replaced all the existing treaties on the topic. The Single Convention was desirable due to the fact that there were several international treaties that made it very complex, whereas one convention provided more survey-ability and decisiveness (Lande, 1962: 778). There were different opinions among the seventy-three member states, the opinion of the United States, as became clear from the previous chapter, was radical and in favour of control measures. The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs paved the path for the U.S. hard-liner source control as will become clear in the following sections. With regard to coca eradication in the Chapare, especially article 26 and article 35 of the convention are essential. Article 26 states that ‘they shall destroy coca bushes if illegally cultivated’. Years later in 1988, with the implementation of

Ley 1008, most of the coca in the Chapare was declared to be illegal and should therefore be destroyed according to this convention. Article 35 talks about ‘action against illicit trade’, which is used by the United States to legitimize their War on Drugs, due to the fact that they want to take action against illicit trade by attacking the problem at the source. In general, according to this convention assistance should be given to developing countries, since they cannot solve the problem on their own. Developed countries should supply technical and financial assistance. The United States fulfilled its role by helping Andean countries during the 1980s and 1990s. However, given the cultural significance attached to coca in Bolivia, as well as in other Andean countries, as mentioned in the previous chapter, lawmakers were required to permit limited coca leaf production to supply the domestic traditional market (Grisaffi, 2010: 431). Therefore, in the convention it stated that the tradition of coca chewing in the Andes is still permitted (SCND, 1961: 23). This also resulted in the partial permission of growing coca according to Ley 1008, mainly in the other main coca producing region in Bolivia: the Yungas, in the Chapare most coca was declared to be illegal and should therefore be destroyed. In the next section the foundation and passage of Ley 1008 and its consequences will be discussed.

Ley 1008, 1988

Ley 1008 (Law 1008) enacted in 1988 distinguishes between legal and illegal coca in Bolivia. The law was a revision of Bolivian drug control legislation undertaken at U.S. behest (Ledebur, 2005: 145) and it laid the foundation for the coca eradication. Although it was a Bolivian national law, it was strongly influenced by the United States. U.S. legal export helped draft the law and U.S. officials pushed for the passage of this law. Furthermore the Bolivian vice president admitted that he already promised to the U.S. that the law would be approved (Ledebur, 2005: 151). On the other hand, the U.S. affirmed that the passage of the law would lead to economic assistance. Thus, besides help with the content of the law, there was also political and economic pressure, which clearly shows the interdependence between the countries and the transnational diffusion of U.S. norms and ideas transferred through coercion. When examining Ley 1008, some articles stand out and will be discussed in greater detail. For example, Article 4 describes legal coca as ‘the social and cultural practices of the Bolivian people in traditional forms, such as acullicu and chewing and

medicinal and ritual uses'. The acceptance of traditional coca leaf chewing relates back to Single Convention of 1961, in which traditional drug use forms an exception to the drug prohibition. In article 7 illicit coca use as defined 'as all those that are aimed at making base, sulphate or cocaine hydrochloride, other uses by which the alkaloid is extracted for the manufacture of any type of controlled substance, and contraband activity and illicit coca traffic contrary to the provisions established by the present Law'. Thus the coca production aimed at the manufacturing of cocaine is forbidden by Ley 1008. With the distinction between legal and illegal drugs, the law distinguishes between three coca-producing zones: The traditional production zone, the transitional excess production zone and the illegal production zone (Article 8). The division between these production zones and the distinction between legal and illegal coca, provided a legal foundation for the U.S. funded eradication programs (Ledebur, 2005: 151). The crop substitution and alternative development policies as invented and executed by the USAID have been diffused to Bolivian policy, as is visible in article 13: 'Substitution for coca cultivation is understood to mean the process by which the economic and social dynamic arising from the capital involved in illicit traffic in coca production is changed by promoting the adoption of new, legal, alternative production and social patterns which ensure a sufficient income for the subsistence of the family unit'. This is a clear example of how the norm of development from U.S. policy has influenced legislation in Bolivia. The end of Ley 1008 is devoted to transnational policy diffusion. In Article 145, drug traffic is regarded as a 'transnational offence', which should be controlled not only by the National Council Against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trade, but also in cooperation with foreign Governments and international agencies, for example the Government of the United States and the United States Agency for International Development. Finally, in Article 147 international agreements regarding illicit drug traffic, for example the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs amongst others, shall be subordinated to constitutional provisions. This is a clear example of how international policy diffuses and influences domestic policies and legislation.

In conclusion, both the Foreign Assistance Act and the Alliance for Progress policy both clearly demonstrate U.S. ideology of democratizing and developing the Third World. Both documents show the diffusion of U.S. norms and values, where

democracy and development can be regarded as the most essential ones. Democracy refers to political democracy and includes freedom, liberty and free institutions and aims at worldwide peace promotion, mainly to secure U.S. freedom. On the other hand, development means more economic development and includes plans, programs and funding from the United States to assist in developing countries. The Alliance for Progress can be regarded as the Latin American version of the Foreign Assistance Act, since the norms and ideas are similar, but specifically diffused to Latin American countries. The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs was signed in the same year as the other documents. Although this convention focuses less on democracy and development, it shows U.S. influence, the transnational interdependence and the diffusion of U.S. norms through coercion as the United States is one of the most powerful countries worldwide and influenced the convention to a large extent. The U.S. influence was even more extensive in the Bolivian Ley 1008 enacted in 1988. The use of political and economic coercion, as a result from the unequal and interdependent relationship between the two countries, facilitated the U.S. transnational diffusion of the norms and transformed them into Bolivian legislation.

3. The Chapare Regional Development Project: Paper, Evaluations and Reports

The previous chapter discussed legislation in the form of acts and laws concerning foreign policy and drug control. In this chapter The Chapare Regional Development Project Paper will be discussed in detail, followed by evaluations written for and by the USAID to reflect on the progress of the coca eradication and alternative development during and after the project. Finally, recent USAID reports will be reviewed, as they provide a good overview of the USAID ideology with regard to their work in Bolivia. In this manner the intentions of the policies and programs will become clear and these papers and reports will illustrate the transnational diffusion of the U.S. norms of development and democracy in practice.

First of all, the most important official USAID document regarding the alternative development projects will be discussed in detail: The USAID Chapare Regional Development Project, which was signed with the Government of Bolivia in August 1983. The project is part of the War on Drugs, this U.S. foreign policy started due to the growth in coca production. The coca production in the Chapare also increased since 1979 due to several reasons. First of all, aforementioned, due to the increasing international demand, with an extreme increase in coca demand in the United States. Second of all, there was an increasing amount of farmers migrating to the Chapare. Finally, the coca produced in the Chapare contained higher amounts of alkaline, which is preferred by cocaine producers (CRDP, 1983: 16). However, the greatest obstacle to development in the Chapare was coca itself, since it was the 'primary cash crop' (16) of the region and hard to replace it with other crops, because farmers were not willing to give up their income, especially not since poverty rates were high in the Chapare. The risk with new crops is that it takes time before they generate profit. The coca control program consisted of voluntary and involuntary eradication of illegal coca as well as the control of the legal sale, which was allowed to provide the indigenous populations of Bolivia with coca with traditional coca uses, such as coca leaf chewing (CRDP, 1983: 19). Besides eradication of coca production, also coca trafficking should be eliminated. In order to achieve the goals control and development should be coordinated. The Chapare Project is in line with the U.S.

government policy, which focused on improvements in: narcotics control, democracy and development. The objective of the Chapare Regional Development was to solve 'developmental problems' (CRDP, 1983: 23), including economic recovery, food emergency, decrease illegal coca and the expansion private sector Bolivian economy.

The problem definition and objective of USAID resulted in the main aim of The Chapare Regional Development as outlined in the Project Paper, which was to improve 'income and living for Chapare farmers and reduction of coca' (CRDP, 1983: 1). The idea behind the project as well as behind the War on Drugs in general was to get rid of the widespread, uncontrolled coca production for illicit markets, however the project also emphasized the development of the living conditions of the farmers, which reflected the ideas of the Foreign Assistance Act and the Alliance for Progress, which both reflected the ideology that the United States should help developing countries in order to develop and democratize. Crop substitution had been invented as a solution to coca eradication, however it was hard to find a crop or combination of crops that would substitute for illicit coca income (CRDP, 1983: 3). The Chapare Regional Development project lasted five years. Within those five years, the reduction coca production with 20,000 hectares was the main objective of the Project (CRDP, 1983: 22). A strong focus on the diffusion of development was present within this Project Paper, as we also saw in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Alternative Development: Infrastructure and Health Care

The purpose of the project was not only to supply the famers with alternative crops, but also supply alternative development by investments in the lacking social infrastructure of the region. The road system in the Chapare in 1983 was inadequate; the roads within the region were almost non-existent. The few roads that were present are of low quality and inaccessible during the rain season. Furthermore, electricity was only available from diesel generators, which are very unreliable. Potable water supply was only available in a few places in the area. This included the construction and improvement of roads, water and electricity supply (CRDP, 1983: 11). Developed infrastructure is necessary in order to facilitate long-term, sustainable economic development. The education level in the Chapare was surprisingly high, however

there was only primary education available, the opportunities to attain secondary education were hardly inexistent. Health care was very poor and will therefore also be a field of investment and improvement, because good health care also contributes to development and the reduction of poverty. The promotion of development sounds broad and vague, however the Project Paper discussed three concrete side projects that are part of the overall regional development and address the problems as discussed above. The first project, *Rural Roads II (061)*, consist of upgrading 230 kilometers of roads with a fund of \$9 million. Secondly, \$1 million will be spend on the installation of water systems and latrines as part of the *Rural Potable Water Project (058)*. Finally, *Village Development (062)* will use \$1.5 million for the construction of community-based infrastructure, such as irrigation systems, bridges, health posts and schools (CRDP, 1983: 22). All these side projects are funded and coordinated by USAID. All in all, the side projects were designed to contribute to the elimination of poverty, which is essential for the successfulness of the project, because the USAID believes that if the circumstances are better, small farmers do not consider coca production the only opportunity to increase their standard of living. As mentioned before, the United States believed that coca production hinders progress in Bolivia; therefore the eradication of coca combined with alternative development programs, of which improving roads, water supply, electricity, education and health care are core examples, founded and funded by the U.S. will contribute to the diffusion of economic development and political democracy.

Alternative Development: Agricultural projects

Due to the main purpose of the Chapare Regional Development being development, in line with the ideas behind the U.S. foreign policies as discussed in chapter two, logically the project goal is defined as ‘economic development’ and the project purpose is described as ‘improve an modify agriculture’. The goal and purpose combined results in the general project policy of ‘alternative development’. In order to reach the goal and purpose, subprojects are created. One of the subprojects is fruit production in cooperation with the largest food processing company of Bolivia: Dillmann. The farmers will form grower’s associations and will produce for the firm Dillmann. The fruit produced by the small farmers of the Chapare will be used to make juices and other fruit products mainly intended for the export market (CRDP,

1983: 43-46). Most crops traditionally grow in the Chapare (CRDP, 1983: 86), however a downside of the Chapare is that Large scale production not possible due to poor soil, therefore improvement in the agricultural system are needed to have crop substitution to a large extent in which it will be sufficient to substitute for the coca incomes. Another subproject is also in cooperation with Dillmann and it concerns the fattening of piglets and the selling of pork meat (CRDP, 1983: 52). In order to create greater economic diversity, there is not only agricultural development, yet also cattle breeding development to ensure a great variety of products being produced in the Chapare. These agricultural development projects facilitate Alternative Development and support the U.S. ideas of development and progress. The agricultural projects are concrete examples of how the U.S. diffuses the norms of development and how a relationship of interdependence is created.

Diffusion through coercion: U.S. Military Intervention

In conclusion, the USAID used a control and development approach (CRDP, 1983: 24), which included monitoring as well as funding the projects and programs and evaluating the progress and pitfalls of the Chapare Regional Development Project. According to USAID besides economic benefits, the Alternative Development projects also resulted in social and political benefits. However these are difficult or even impossible to put into number. However some scholars doubt these positive effects due to the militarization of the Drug War, which led to tensions and unrest in the region. In the literature review the militarization of the War on Drugs described by Bruce Bagley have been introduced and will be discussed in more detail in relation to the USAID. The military aid to Andean region, including the Chapare in Bolivia, started under the counternarcotic programs of George H.W. Bush. The War on Drugs really became a battle against illegal drugs (Marcy, 2010: 133). The 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act (an amendment on 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act) which amongst other things allowed congressional request for the U.S. military to set up its participation in the fight against narcotics (Marcy, 2010: 135). By 1989, the year Bush sr. took the U.S. presidency the War on Drugs was not successful and therefore tougher measurements were needed according to his opinion. These hard measurements clearly show the power and influence of the United States as well as the coercion element of diffusion as mentioned before. Until the presidency of Bush

sr. coercion consisted mainly of economic sanctions or rewards, while no military coercion was added. The USAID only focuses on Alternative Development as a solution for the development with regard to coca eradication, however there is another side to the medal: military pressure on guerillas and traffickers (Marcy, 2010: 162). The militarization of the War on Drugs created a dangerous and anxious atmosphere in the Chapare, which makes scholars doubt about the successes achieved by the United States, although coca eradication was successful, Alternative Development is not believed to be successful by everyone. However for the purpose of this essay the successfulness of the policies are not of great importance, what is important is the fact that the policies and projects discussed in these chapters all show the diffusion of U.S. norms. The general ideas of development and democracy and the idea of drugs elimination, which is closely linked to the case study, researched in this thesis are repeated throughout all documents. Coercion has been defined as the type of transnational diffusion of U.S. norms through the policies and programs in the Chapare. The military intervention in the Chapare illustrates the use of coercion in order to diffuse the U.S. ideas, norms and policies.

Evaluations of Chapare Regional Development Project

Furthermore, The Chapare Regional Development has been evaluated and reviewed several times, for example in 1986 and 1990 for USAID/Bolivia. Within these evaluation reports the project was analysed while it was still proceeding and recommendations to the USAID were given. According to this evaluation report there has been a successful control of coca from 1983 till 1986. Although the control of coca should be continued for the next years in order to provide development. For economic development 'mixed cropping' (Evaluation CRDP, 1986, 3) is essential according to the evaluators. The evaluation report of 1990 for the USAID concerning the Chapare Regional Development Project, outlines several pitfalls of the project. For example, although the projects success will depend on the economic viability of alternative crops adopted by farmers, there have been no marketing studies of the markets for the proposed crop substitutes (Evaluation CRDP, 1990, 2). The investments in infrastructure are essential to economic development and the export of the alternative crops as outlined above, however until 1990 the roads for example had not been constructed yet, due to the fear of aiding coca traffickers if doing so. Finally,

the evaluation report suggests that the focus should be shifted away from coca eradication and move towards poverty reduction and alternative development, because farmers will only stop producing coca if it is in their economic interest (Evaluation CRDP, 1990: 3). It is essential to the success of the project that the small-farmers in the Chapare really benefit from the project. In conclusion, the focus on development is crucial.

Recent USAID Reports

Recently, in 2010 and 2013, the USAID have published two reports on the history of USAID in Bolivia, both reports will be discussed since they provide a clear view of the USAID and the U.S. norms and ideas based in the Foreign Assistance Act and the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. The USAID/Bolivia report emphasizes their three main goals of democratic progress, alternative development and antinarcotics programs between 1980-1999 (USAID, 2010: 9). Alternative development was the solution to the coca eradication policies, to make sure that farmers were able to grow other crops and make a living that did not include coca. However alternative development did not only include crop substitution, but also the promotion of sustainable growth (USAID, 2010: 9). Development and democracy are the reoccurring main norms that come across in this report. Through economic development and political democracy promotion an alternative to the coca economy in Bolivia should be given. USAID provided assistance and support for democratic development in order to strengthen the democratic institutions. This focus on development relates back to the fourth broad foreign policy towards Latin America: Alliance for Progress (USAID, 2010: 21).

Alternative Development in Bolivia started fifteen years after the Single Convention of Narcotic Drugs, when Henry Kissinger¹ visited Bolivia and donated five million dollars. The coca eradication and Alternative Development were initiated by the United States already during the 1970s. Only during the 1980s The Chapare Yungas Development Project was invented to promote other crops than coca (USAID, 2010: 22). This project did not only including replacing coca by other crops, but

¹ Henry Kissinger was the 56th United States Secretary of State. He was in office from 1973 and 1977

finding a substitute to the coca economy and replacing the economy as a whole (USAID, 2010: 24). The USAID Alternative Development program constituted of two stages. The first stage was to find alternatives to coca, in other words to investigate which crops are suitable in the region. The second stage included the importation and planting of the seeds of the crop substitutes. In 1988, the Chapare Development Project was legally backed up with Ley 1008 (USAID, 2010: 24). During 1990s, the USAID/Bolivia outlined three areas of assistance: for sustainable participatory economic growth, for the democratic progress and for the antinarcotic programs by means of Alternative Development (USAID, 2010: 25). If we relate these three issues to U.S. foreign policy norms, the first one refers to the spread of U.S. economic development, the second to the promotion of democracy and the latter relates to the U.S. War on Drugs. The Sustainable Economic Growth Program of the USAID did not only include new crops, such as banana, cacao, coffee, palm heart and pineapple (USAID, 2010: 27), but also focused on parallel development such as roads and electricity, in order to provide the Chapare with sustainable and diversified economic development. Furthermore the USAID Democracy Program supported Bolivia in its efforts to strengthen the country's democratic system and increase transparency and effective governance (USAID, 2010: 28).

The other USAID Report, called 'Building a Better Future', summarizes the history of USAID/Bolivia from 1961 to 2013. The cooperation between the USAID and Bolivia ended in the year 2013. During the 1960s more attention was paid to Latin America due to Kennedy's Alliance for Progress policy, which especially focused on the relationships with Latin America. In order to develop the country USAID provided technical and financial assistance. During the 1960s the main focus of USAID was famines, malnutrition and the health sector, during the 1970s focus shifted toward agriculture, economic growth, education and poverty reduction (USAID, 2013: 6). Alternative Development, which should provide farmers with alternative to coca production, started in the 1980s. Coca production did not only affected the U.S. population as well as crime on the Western Hemisphere, it also threatened the Bolivian economy as well as its democracy. During the 1990s foreign policy in Bolivia was centered on the themes of building democracy and economic growth. We can state that development and democracy were the main norms

throughout the USAID cooperation with Bolivia (USAID, 2013: 14). As the USAID describes this relationship to the Government of Bolivia in their report: ‘USAID partnered with the Government of Bolivia ... with a focus on building democratic processes and systems, encouraging broad-based economic growth, and increasing investment, productivity, and employment in non-coca activities’ (USAID, 2013: 38). The main norms of U.S. foreign policy, democracy and development, are promoted again, as well as the specific aim of the Chapare Project namely the elimination of illicit coca and the development of alternative activities. From this report can be concluded that the 1980s were marked by coca eradication and crop substitution in the Chapare, whereas the 1990s were characterized by the continuation of these programs and put more emphasis on non-coca economic development and the promotion of democracy.

UN Office on Drugs and Crime

Besides the USAID project paper, the evaluations on the project and the USAID reports, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime published a report on Coca Cultivation in the Andean Region. ‘Coca cultivation decreased significantly in Bolivia at the end of the 1990s, following a significant reduction in the area under coca cultivation in the Chapare region. Bolivia is now the third largest coca producer worldwide, far behind Colombia and Peru.’ (UNODC, 2007: 21). The UN Office on Drugs and Crime acknowledges that laws and acts, of which the most important ones have been discussed in the previous chapters, are essential, however it not only about effective law enforcement. The support for development assistance, as provided by the USAID through Alternative Development for example, are of major importance, since they create better future prospects for the farmers. When poverty is being reduced and alternative options are facilitated, the temptation of growing ‘lucrative illicit crops’ declines. In conclusion, due to sustained eradication efforts and alternative development programs, coca cultivation decreased dramatically during the 1980s and 1990s in the Chapare (UNODC, 2007: 37). As can be deducted from all documents described above, democracy and development remain the most important norms within U.S. foreign policy based on the ideology that the United States has the responsibility to assist developing countries to make progress in economic and political sense. Although the main aim of the Chapare project was to eradicate coca,

alternative development programs were needed in order to achieve this. The U.S. foreign drug policy in the Chapare is a way of transnational diffusion of the U.S. norms of development and democracy.

In conclusion, the United States played an important role in international as well as Bolivian drug control legislation embedded in their own ideas regarding the War on Drugs. In the reports and evaluation discussed above Alternative Development as a solution for coca eradication in the Chapare is the main topic. The ideas of providing assistance and equipping alternative opportunities to former coca farmers are encapsulated in U.S. ideology as presented in the Foreign Assistance Act and Alliance for Progress. According to Youngers, the USAID programs to promote democratic development, institutional reform and economic assistance were successful and important (2005: 341). All the project and programs in the Chapare are founded and funded by the United States through USAID. This clearly indicates a relationship of interdependence between the United States and Bolivia. Moreover, the case study of the Chapare illustrates how the U.S. used its political and economic power to diffuse the ideas. Although the main purpose of the Chapare Development Project was to eradicate coca the diffusion of U.S. norms through this project, and in that manner to continue the U.S. influence and control in the region, are as important.

Conclusion

The foreign policies of the United States have been oriented towards Latin America ever since the Monroe Doctrine in 1823. The group of scholars, including Williams, Brown, Kenworthy and Figueiredo, that critique U.S. foreign policies, believe that U.S. foreign policies have only created more problems. Due to the fact that the United States was acting as the Empire or neo-colonizer good relationships with Latin America were never established. Furthermore resentment against the United States grew due to military intervention and coercion in diffusing U.S. norms, ideas and values, as described by Bagley and Marcy. Whether the development was successful in the Chapare has been disputed too. Many scholars, for example Zoomers, state that development in the Chapare has failed, mainly due to the lack of knowledge of traditional farmers. While official documents from the USAID declare the coca eradication and alternative development to be very successful. However the aim of this essay was not to enter into the debate of effectiveness or successfulness, but rather to take a transnational perspective and evaluate how the U.S. foreign drug policies in the Chapare were used for the promotion of economic development and stable democracy as main norms of U.S. foreign policy. The case study of the U.S. founded and funded programs of coca eradication, crop substitution and Alternative Development in the Chapare have been used as examples of U.S. foreign policy in a specific place and at a specific time. When examining the acts, laws and project papers in relation to the case study, we established that besides the general idea behind foreign policy of security and the specific idea related to the War on Drugs of drug elimination at the source, development and democracy are U.S. norms and values that tend to diffuse to other countries through a variety of foreign policies.

Foreign policies are inherently transnational as they transcend national borders and move away from a national focus. The programs and policies in the Chapare are part of an international movement and cooperation in the fight against drugs, which started with the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs signed by seventy-three countries, including Bolivia and The United States, in 1961. In the same year, John F. Kennedy announced a new major policy focused on Latin America known as the Alliance for Progress, which intended to create cooperation between Latin America

and the United States in order to reach economic development, cultural progress, political freedom and social reform by supplying capital and technical skills from the United States. The title of John F. Kennedy's policy already indicated a focus on 'progress', which from U.S. perspective includes the norms of development and democracy. These norms are necessary in order to make progress and to move forward according to the United States. The foreign policies focusing on developing countries, such as Bolivia, in order to make progress, are seen as an obligation by the United States. The coca eradication and alternative development programs in the Chapare are based on the ideas of the Alliance for Progress and the Foreign Assistance Act as they aim for sustainable economic development by providing U.S. skills and funding. The Foreign Assistance Act formed the basis of the transnational diffusion of economic development and political democracy, since the act shaped the U.S. ideology on foreign policy, which included the responsibility to provide assistance to developing countries in order to help them move forward. The U.S. norms are transnationally diffused by the use of coercion, which is considered to be one of the types of transnational diffusion. In the case of U.S. foreign drug policy aimed at the Chapare region in Bolivia the presence of coercion in economic, political and military manners helped to convey the U.S. norms of economic development and political democracy. Transnational diffusion in a coercive manner was possible due to the interdependent relationship between the United States and Bolivia, which can be explained by applying Wallerstein's world systems theory, in which a distinction between the core and periphery is made. From a transnational approach the coca eradication, crop substitution and alternative development programs, as part of the U.S. War on Drugs foreign policy, in the Chapare, clearly demonstrate the U.S. ideology of assistance in developing countries through the transnational diffusion of the U.S. norms of economic development and political democracy.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Conklin, H. 'Suggested Strategies for Developing Agriculture in Bolivia'. New York: Cornell Agricultural Economics Staff Paper, 1987.

Evaluation of Chapare Regional Development Project (Evaluation CRDP), *Tropical Research and Development*. Gainesville: 1986

Evaluation of the Chapare Regional Development Project (Evaluation CRDP), 1990

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (FAA), 1961

Ley del Regimen de la Coca y Sustancias Controladas (Ley 1008), 1988

Project Paper: Chapare Regional Development (CRDP), 1983

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). 'Coca cultivation in the Andean Region: A survey of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru'. 2007

United Nations 'Single Convention on Narcotic Drug' (SCND), 1961

USAID in Bolivia (USAID). '46 Years Working Together' 2010

USAID in Bolivia (USAID), 'Building a Better Future' 2013

Academic sources

Alvarez, H. 'Economic Development, Restructuring and the Illicit Drug Sector in Bolivia and Peru: Current Policies'. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*. Vol. 37, No. 3, Special Issue: Report on Neoliberal Restructuring (1995): 125-149

Bagley, B. 'Myths of Militarization: Enlisting Armed Forces in the War on Drugs' in *Drug Policy in the Americas*, edited by Smith, P. San Diego: *Westview Press* (1992): 129-150

Brown, M. *Informal Empire in Latin America: Culture, Commerce and Capital*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008

Farthing, L. & Kohl, B. 'Conflicting Agendas: The Politics of Development Aid in Drug-Producing Areas'. *Development Policy Review* (2005): 183-198

Farthing, L. & Kohl, B. 'Mobilizing Memory: Bolivia's Enduring Social Movements'. *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest* (2013): 361-376

Figueiredo, J. 'U.S. Foreign Policy in Latin America: Time for a Change' *Orbis* Vol. 51 (2007): 679-709

Gilardi, F. 'Transnational diffusion: Norms, ideas, and policies' in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth Simmons, *Handbook of International Relations*, Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications (2012): 453-477

Grisaffi, T. 'We Are Originarios . . . 'We Just Aren't from Here': Coca leaf and Identity Politics in the Chapare, Bolivia'. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (2010): 425-439

Hallums, M. 'Bolivia and Coca: law, policy and drug control'. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law* (1997): 817-862

Hellin, J. 'Coca Eradication in the Andes – Lessons from Bolivia'. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* (2001): 139-157

Kenworthy, E. *America/Américas: Myth in the Making of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995

Khagram, S. & P, Levitt. 'Constructing Transnational Studies' in *The Transnational Studies Reader*, New York, Routledge (2008): 1-22

Lande, A. 'The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961'. *International Organization*, Volume 16, Issue 04 (1962): 776 - 797

Ledebur, K. 'Bolivia: Clear Consequences' in *Drugs and Democracy in Latin America: The Impact of U.S. Policy* edited by Youngers, C. & E, Rosin. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers (2005): 143-184

Lee, R. 'The Latin American Drug Connection'. *Foreign Policy*, No. 61 (Winter, 1985-1986): 142-159

Leichtman, E. 'Bolivia, Coca and US Foreign Policy'. *Critical Criminology* (2000): 63-84

Leon, P. 'Compliance and Cooperation? US Narcotics Policy Abroad and the Response of Target Countries'. Diss. University of California, 2003

Machicado, F. 'Coca Production in Bolivia' in *Drug Policy in the Americas*, edited by Smith, P. San Diego: Westview Press (1992): 88-98

Marcy, W.L. 'The Politics of Cocaine: How U.S. Foreign Policy Has Created a Thriving Drug Industry in Central and South America'. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2010

Pastor, R. *Exiting the Whirlpool: U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Latin America and the Caribbean*. Colorado: Westview Press, 2001

Risse-Kappen, T. 'Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Introduction' in *The Transnational Studies Reader*, New York, Routledge (2008): 459-473

Santos, S. 'Unintended Consequences of United States' Foreign Drug Policy in Bolivia'. *University of Miami Inter-American Law Review* Vol.33(1) (2002):127-151

Schmitt, K. *Contradictions and Conflicts in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of Latin America*. Washington State University Press, 1968

- Schoultz, L. *Beneath the United States: A history of U.S. policy toward Latin America*. London: Harvard University Press, 1998
- South, R. 'Coca in Bolivia'. *Geographical Review*, Vol. 67, No 1. (1997): 22-33
- Tsolakis, A. 'Transnational Elite Forces, Restructuring and Resistance in Bolivia', *Law, Social Justice & Global Development Journal (LGD)* (2009): 1-
- Tyrrell, I. 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History', *American Historical Review*, no. 96 (1991): 1031-1055
- Wallerstein, I. 'World-Systems Analysis: Theoretical and Interpretative Issues' in *World-Systems Analysis: Theory and Methodology* by Hopkins, T.K. et al. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications (1982): 91-103
- Williams, W. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York: Dell Publishing Co, 1961.
- Youngers, C.A. 'The Collateral Damage of the U.S. War on Drugs: Conclusions and Recommendations' in *Drugs and Democracy in Latin America: The Impact of U.S. Policy* edited by Youngers, C. & E, Rosin. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers (2005): 339-366
- Zoomers, A. *Linking livelihood strategies to development: Experiences from the Bolivian Andes*. Amsterdam: KIT Press, 1999