

INTERNAL SECURITY REFORM PROGRAM

INITIATIVE REPORT

COMBATING TERRORISM: THE CHALLENGE FOR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES

Harvard University
February 25-27, 2002

From February 25 to 27, 2002, the Project on Justice in Times of Transition of Harvard University held an executive session at the Kennedy School of Government that brought together leaders from the law enforcement and intelligence communities in Mexico, Peru, and the United States to discuss the challenges involved in combating terrorism while protecting democratic freedoms. The Project recognized that as a result of the events of September 11th, changes were being made to the nature of intelligence-gathering in many countries - yet there was not enough thoughtful discussion about how to design responsible counter-terrorism initiatives that protect both national security and human rights. A working group of individuals from Mexico, Peru, and the US with experience dealing with terrorism was convened to discuss strategies for combating terrorism while maintaining reform efforts and a commitment to democratic values.

Combating terrorism is currently a challenge for internal security agencies worldwide, yet this meeting focused only on the cases of Mexico, Peru, and the United States. Mexico and Peru, like many Latin American countries, are faced with the challenges of reforming their internal security agencies - which for many years have functioned outside of the rule of law - as well as responding to the call for heightened security to prevent terrorism.

As the US leads the "War on Terrorism," it is confronted with challenging questions about how to strike a balance between liberty and security both at home and abroad. *Combating Terrorism: The Challenge for Democratic Societies* was designed to create a neutral forum for practitioners from Mexico, Peru, and the United States to assess the new demands that have been put on intelligence and law enforcement agencies and ways to combat terrorism that are both responsible and effective.

During the first two days of the program, members of the working group discussed the legacy of intelligence activities and reform efforts in Mexico, Peru, and the United States; past experiences with combating terrorism; and the current demands on the intelligence and law enforcement communities in their countries. On the third day, the group reflected on whether intelligence reform and counter-terrorism are compatible, and how the lessons learned by certain countries about instituting democratic reforms and successfully combating terrorism may be applied to other contexts. Each session began with one or two presentations, which were followed by a period of open discussion.

A diverse group took part in the meeting, which resulted in a series of dynamic and thought-provoking discussions. The sessions were moderated by Philip Heymann, Professor of Law at Harvard University and Faculty Chair of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition. The group was made up of individuals with significant experience dealing with terrorism, including former

and current political leaders and policy-makers, leaders of non-governmental organizations, and academics. The group included the following individuals:

- **Raul Benitez Manaut**, Professor of International Relations, National University of Mexico
- **John Coatsworth**, Professor of History and Monroe Gutman Professor of Latin American Affairs at Harvard University; Director of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies
- **Jorge Chabat**, Professor of International Relations, Center for Economic Research and Teaching, Mexico
- **Neil Gallagher**, Senior Vice President at Bank of America with Responsibility for Homeland Security; former Assistant Director of the US Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Security Division
- **Philip Heymann**, James Barr Ames Professor of Law at Harvard University; former US Deputy Attorney General; Faculty Chair of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition
- **Benedicto Jimenez Bacca**, Expert Advisor to the United Nations' Counter-Terrorism Committee, Peru
- **Kate Martin**, Director of the Center for National Security Studies, United States
- **Robert M. McNamara, Jr.**, Managing Director of Manatt Jones Global Strategies and Partner at Manatt, Phelps & Phillips; former General Counsel of the US Central Intelligence Agency
- **Enrique Obando Arbulú**, President of the Political and Strategic Studies Institute, Peru
- **William Rooney**, Associate of the Clarridge Group; former Executive and Field Operations Officer of the US Central Intelligence Agency
- **Armando Salinas Torre**, President of the Congressional Commission on Governance and Public Security, Mexico
- **Oscar Schiappa-Pietra**, Mason Fellow at the Kennedy School of Government; former Senior Advisor to the Prime Minister of Peru
- **Juan Velit Granda**, President of the National Council of Intelligence, Peru
- **Ketin Vidal**, former Minister of the Interior and Director of the National Counter-terrorism Council, Peru

Day 1: The Legacy of Intelligence Activities and Reform Efforts in Mexico, Peru, and the US

The program began with an opening address by Philip Heymann, Professor of Law at Harvard University and former US Deputy Attorney General, who noted the significance of the discussion that was to take place and the parameters for the meeting. He explained that the events of September 11th had made it more critical than ever to ensure that both the democratic structures that guarantee democracy are not threatened, and counter-terrorism and intelligence operations remain effective.



Professor Philip Heymann, Faculty Chair, Project on Justice in Times of Transition and Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

Heymann said that Peru and Mexico were two of the Latin American countries with the greatest commitment to controlling their internal security agencies, and highlighted the reasons why intelligence activities in many countries are often left unregulated: a lack of political will to enact reforms and insufficient mechanisms of oversight. He explained that counter-terrorism initiatives can fall into the categories of significantly helping to combat terrorism, significantly interfering with democratic values, or gaining support from the public or allies. The challenge is to ensure that democratic values are not compromised by steps taken to deal with terrorism.

Peruvian Intelligence: Past Abuses and Current Efforts of Reform

The first session focused on the legacy of intelligence abuses in Peru and the challenges that Peruvian leadership now faces in reforming its internal security services. Juan Velit, President of Peru's National Council of Intelligence, put Peruvian intelligence in a historical context and discussed the current reality he faces in reforming the existing intelligence apparatus.

He explained that Peruvian intelligence has historically been repressive, reactive rather than proactive, lacking operational efficiency, and compromised by rivalries between agencies. Under the Fujimori administration, the intelligence services were used to consolidate power and marked by high levels of corruption and illegal activities, such as extortion and racketeering. Despite the democratic transition that has taken place since the departure of President Fujimori and former Intelligence Chief, Vladimiro Montesinos, Peru's intelligence agencies are still in a dire situation - lacking technical equipment, trained personnel, documentation and files.

Oscar Schiappa-Pietra, Mason Fellow at the Kennedy School of Government and former Senior Advisor to the Prime Minister of Peru, explained that although many of the problems of Peruvian intelligence are often attributed to Montesinos, they largely existed before the Fujimori years and continue to exist today. These problems include a lack of intellectual capital, poor strategic and analytical capacity, and insufficient civilian oversight mechanisms.

Schiappa-Pietra said that intelligence reform in Peru must be seen in the broader context of military reform, and he highlighted some of the changes needed within Peruvian intelligence agencies: improved analytic capacity, standards and code of conduct, and relations with civil society. Despite the unprecedented democratic transition, President Toledo has been slow to enact reforms, and, according to Schiappa-Pietra, mounting social unrest and waning support for the Toledo administration will prove challenges.

The role of US intelligence in Peru was among the issues that were raised in the discussion that followed. Participants assessed the level of involvement that the US intelligence agencies have

had in Peru, and whether the interaction has been positive or negative. William Rooney, former Executive and Field Operations Officer in the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) said that the CIA had worked closely with President Fujimori, whom they viewed as a democratically elected leader, without complete knowledge of the abuses that were taking place in Peru.

Juan Velit explained that Peru now has to walk a very fine line in its relationship with the CIA, as interaction with the CIA often has created a negative reaction from the public. Ketin Vidal, former Minister of the Interior in Peru, added that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) played a key role in helping his ministry capture Abimael Guzmán, head of the Shining Path.



Neil Gallagher, Senior Vice President at Bank of America with Responsibility for Homeland Security and Ketin Vidal, former Minister of the Interior in Peru

Enrique Obando, President of the Political and Strategic Studies Institute in Peru, raised the issue of military and intelligence budget cuts as a component of the reform process. He said that in Peru defense budgets have been cut so sharply that they are the lowest that they have been in history, making it difficult for the Peruvian armed services to function. Juan Velit, President of the Peruvian National Council of Intelligence, defended the budget cuts, saying that they were needed to counter-act the negative legacy and public perception of the military in Peru.

Controlling Intelligence Activities in Mexico

Like Peru, Mexico has made a transition to democracy and is in the process of reforming its intelligence services so that it addresses real national security needs and functions within the rule of law.

Raul Benitez Manaut, Professor of International Relations at the National University of Mexico, noted that from 1929 to 2000 Mexican intelligence agencies were used to consolidate the power of the Institutionalized Revolutionary Party (PRI). He said that political spying was carried out to collect information on opponents of the PRI, and domestic intelligence made up 95% of the country's intelligence activities.

Despite the transition to democracy under President Vicente Fox, problems remain for Mexican internal security; according to Benitez, there is little strategic capability, a lack of professionalism, rampant corruption, and a high level of politicization. He noted that no intelligence doctrine currently exists in Mexico, and although the president can mandate changes to the intelligence agencies, implementation of reforms is a difficult task.

Armando Salinas Torre shared his thoughts on Mexican intelligence from the perspective of a member of the Mexican National Congress and President of the Congressional Commission on Governance and Public Security. He said that a national security doctrine was needed, and that Mexico should look to the experiences of other countries around the world as it worked to create its own definition and parameters for national security and intelligence.

Salinas Torre underlined the importance of having a controlled security and intelligence apparatus in Mexico. He said that congress had the responsibility to oversee domestic

intelligence activities and ensure that they functioned within the rule of law. He pointed to the lack of continuity within the legislature, where congressmen may only serve one three-year term, as a factor that makes oversight of Mexican national security institutions problematic.



Raul Benitez Manaut, Professor of International Relations, National University of Mexico

After the presentations, the floor was opened for discussion. Members of the group spoke at length about political intelligence-gathering, and in particular why it continues to exist in Mexico. Jorge Chabat, Professor of International Relations at the Center for Economic Research and Teaching (CIDE), said that a lack of a legal and conceptual framework for Mexican national security was one of the reasons. Armando Salinas Torre added that Mexico will continue to use political intelligence until there is a clear definition of national security and explicit parameters for intelligence agencies.

Neil Gallagher, former Assistant Director of the US Federal Bureau of Investigation, said that the concept of political intelligence did not exist in the United States. According to Benedicto Jiménez Bacca, Expert Advisor to the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Committee, an absence of democratic institutions can create an authoritarian culture where political leaders rule with a strong hand and use political intelligence to consolidate power.

US Intelligence Agencies and the Development of Control Mechanisms

Kate Martin, Director of the Center for National Security Studies, and Robert McNamara, Jr., former General Counsel of the US Central Intelligence Agency, discussed the system of oversight that exists over intelligence agencies in the United States, as well as the changes that have taken place in the US intelligence community since the events of September 11th. Martin explained that the process of intelligence reform in the US began with the Church Commission, which investigated intelligence abuses that had taken place during the 1960s and 1970s and made recommendations for creating a system of oversight to monitor intelligence activities.

As a result of the Commission's report, congressional oversight was developed, as well as institutionalized checks and balances within the executive branch. A sharp distinction was made between internal and foreign intelligence, and between intelligence and law enforcement. Martin said that while law enforcement agencies collected information that would ultimately be presented in court and used to charge an individual, intelligence agencies gathered information that policy-makers could use to make decisions related to national security issues.

Robert McNamara noted that three factors are fundamental to the function of an intelligence agency: clear authority, accountability, and effective controls. He pointed out the internal and

external checks that exist in the US to monitor intelligence agencies. Internal controls include the Inspector General, the General Counsel's Office, the Chief Financial Officer, and the congressional affairs offices. McNamara also said that agency personnel, including career officers and analysts who have a strong inclination to do the right thing, and whistleblowers, individuals who report on unlawful activities that have transpired within the agencies, act as internal controls.

McNamara also highlighted the external checks over US intelligence activities: congressional oversight, the National Security Council, the Department of Justice, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and the press.

The participants discussed if, and how, the parameters of US intelligence had changed since September 11th. According to Martin, there have been troubling changes - the Patriot Act has mandated changes in wire-tapping procedures, and the FBI has acted more like an internal security agency than ever before. She said that she is concerned with the Bush administration's approach to terrorism - instead of looking at existing law and assessing how it should be changed, the current situation is being viewed as a new problem of radically different dimensions.

Robert McNamara argued that there had been little, if any, change within US intelligence agencies or the systems of oversight. He said that neither the FBI nor the CIA wanted to change the structures of their agencies because they understood how well the existing system functions.

George Vickers, Regional Director for Latin America at the Open Society Institute, noted that the controls that had been described by Martin and McNamara depend on an aggressive judicial system, congressional oversight, and an internal cultural commitment to the rule of law. As these conditions are largely absent in the cases of Mexico and Peru, he asked the group how applicable the US intelligence framework was to other contexts.

Martin noted that it was important to ensure that intelligence agencies were limited by resources, as well as by the laws of the country. Enrique Obando, President of the Political and Strategic Studies Institute in Peru, highlighted the importance of each country creating a system of oversight and controls that is consistent with its national security needs. He noted that France and England, two advanced democracies, have very different mechanisms of oversight.



William Rooney, Associate of the Clarridge Group; former Executive and Field Operations Officer of the US Central Intelligence Agency and Benedicto Jimenez Bacca, Expert Advisor to the United Nations's Counter-Terrorism Committee

Day 2: Counter-Terrorism and the Demands on Intelligence Agencies

New Challenges for the Intelligence and Law Enforcement Community of the Americas

The second day of the program began with remarks by Philip Heymann, Faculty Chair of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition and Professor at Harvard Law School. He discussed some of the highlights of the previous day's discussions and pointed out a number of the acute differences between the way that internal security agencies function in Mexico, Peru, and the United States. For example, the US has a very comfortable relationship with its military, does not worry about the independence of military intelligence, and does not tolerate the investigation of political opposition. Internal security agencies in Mexico and Peru have been used for profit or to consolidate power for the government.

While the previous day was dedicated to the discussion of intelligence reform and controlling the activities of internal security agencies, this part of the program focused on the challenges of combating terrorism in Mexico, Peru, and the United States, particularly in the wake of the events of September 11th.

Heymann noted the importance of maximizing effectiveness and limiting violations of civil liberties, and he pointed out some of the problems that arise in counter-terrorism. For example, in denying access to explosives and targets, monitoring the activities of certain groups, or detaining individuals, questions arise such as: Should certain groups be the focus of attention? Should people who have not been proven likely to be terrorists be detained and monitored?

Combating Terrorism in Peru: Past and Present Challenges

Over the past decade, terrorism has had a serious impact on Peru, killing thousands and devastating the country's infrastructure, financial resources, and national psyche. Ketin Vidal, former Minister of the Interior, and Benedicto Jimenez Bacca, Expert Advisor to the United Nations's Counter-Terrorism Committee, both played a key role in combating terrorism in Peru, and the participants from Mexico and the US found their experiences and lessons learned to be useful in assessing how to deal with the threat of terrorism in their own countries.

Ketin Vidal provided background on the Shining Path, one of Peru's predominant terrorist organizations, and discussed how terrorism was dealt with in Peru. Vidal said that the Shining Path, led by Abimael Guzmán, declared war on the Peruvian state in 1980 and developed a political agenda based on Maoist ideology. The group established clear political and military objectives and used armed struggle, selective assassination, and propaganda to create political and social instability in Peru. In 1990, the Office of Counter-Terrorism, a command unit within the police led by Benedicto Jimenez Bacca, was created. By training intelligence groups and redesigning the police intelligence services, this group was able to capture Abimael Guzmán.

Vidal presented a number of key lessons learned from the Peruvian experience of combating terrorism:

- It is important to understand the underlying convictions and objectives of a terrorist organization.
- Terrorist groups often capitalize on political, economic, and social problems.
- Total protection from terrorism is impossible.
- Intelligence is the most important factor in fighting terrorism, and problems are rarely solved by violent means.

Benedicto Jimenez Bacca also shared his reflections on combating terrorism in Peru. He said that surprise and opportunity were key elements on both sides of the conflict, and one of the government's tactics was to change the habits and working routines of police officers. Jimenez explained that time is in the terrorist's favor, and terrorist organizations often engage in a prolonged war and wait for society to become worn down. He said that anything can become a

tool for terrorists, and sophisticated technology often is not a deterrent to terrorist activities. Jimenez stressed the importance of attacking the financial sources of a terrorist group and limiting their ability to obtain funds. He also noted that it was best to keep the enemy alive, as they did in the case of Abimael Guzmán, and avoid creating a martyr.

The group discussed the ethical question raised by counter-terrorism: Does the end justify the means, particularly when human rights and civil liberties may be violated? Neil Gallagher, former Assistant Director of the FBI's National Security Division, said that the end does not justify the means; if we violate the democratic freedoms that we respect and cherish, then the terrorists have won. Ketin Vidal noted that in Peru efforts were made to act within an ethical and legalistic framework. However, he said that some mistakes were made during the early years of combating terrorism, when they used conventional means (military action) to fight terrorism. This ultimately resulted in a change in the government's approach to counter-terrorism.

Enrique Obando Arbulú, President of the Political and Strategic Studies Institute in Peru, noted that in developing an effective counter-terrorism strategy, it is important to look at the mistakes that the terrorist group is making. The Shining Path committed grave errors, such as closing off roads which made it impossible for farmers to sell their goods and resulted in a decrease in support for the Shining Path. He said that the US should look carefully at the errors that Al Qaeda has made.

Demands on U.S. Intelligence and Law Enforcement Agencies

Based on his experience as Assistant Director of the FBI's National Security and Terrorism Divisions, Neil Gallagher outlined a set of unique demands that internal security agencies now face when they deal with terrorism. He said that it is a challenge to define terrorism in the post-September 11th world. We are able to understand the structures of organizations like the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), yet the makeup of Hamas and Al Qaeda are more difficult to ascertain.

In addition, intelligence and law enforcement agencies must assess how to best deal with raw intelligence, if the information is actionable, and when to issue threat alerts. Gallagher said that often the intelligence community and politicians deal with raw data differently: politicians feel the need to release information more often than necessary, which can have an adverse effect on the public. Time is also a challenge in counter-terrorism, as it can erode security precautions that are initially put in place.



Jorge Chabat, Professor of International Relations, Center for Economic Research and Teaching, Mexico; Kate Martin, Director of the Center for National Security Studies, United States; and Benedicto Jimenez Bacca, Expert Advisor to the United Nations's Counter-Terrorism Committee

Bill Rooney, former Executive and Field Operations Officer in the US Central Intelligence Agency, described the threats of international terrorism that currently exist, as well as the effects of recent terrorist incidents, including the 1998 US embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania. He said that as Al Qaeda is a worldwide network, the question is not if the group will strike again, but rather when and where.

Rooney said that one should not rule out the possibility of Al Qaeda launching attacks in Mexico or Peru, because they are two countries that have shown support for the United States. He noted that good teamwork and youth training, as well as strong leadership within the intelligence services and crisis management skills, are important tools for fighting terrorism.

In the dynamic discussion that followed, the question was raised whether a response that is political, intelligence-based, law enforcement-oriented, or based on military action was most appropriate for addressing terrorism. Raul Benitez Manaut, Professor of International Relations at the National University of Mexico, said that better political solutions for dealing with terrorism were needed to avoid relying on intelligence and military solutions.

Neil Gallagher noted that the events of September 11th changed the way that we deal with terrorism. He said that we are now at war, so we cannot rely solely on intelligence and law enforcement; a military response is also needed. According to Kate Martin, Director of the Center for National Security Studies, although the US has framed the fight against Al Qaeda and international terrorism as a war, the situation is more complicated than that. We must address the roots of terrorism and its long-term effects, and avoid aligning ourselves with governments that repress their citizens.

The group also looked at the nature of US foreign policy, and its response to the events of September 11th. A number of individuals said that the United States does not have enemies - it has interests - and this creates frustration and animosity among other countries, particularly Arab nations. Various participants underlined the need to look at the roots of terrorism and develop a new vision for US foreign policy. Extreme poverty and a climate of political instability were causes of the rise of terrorist organizations in Peru.

Confronting Domestic and International Terrorism in Mexico

The third session of the day was dedicated to a discussion of terrorism in Mexico. Jorge Chabat, Professor of International Relations at the Center for Economic Research and Teaching (CIDE), said that terrorism has not been a significant problem for Mexico, as it has been in Peru. He said that acts of terrorism had been carried out by the government, particularly during the "Dirty War" of the 1970s, however terrorist groups had not played a significant role in Mexico. Chabat explained that guerrilla groups, such as the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN), have not tended to use terrorist tactics, but have instead opted for kidnapping, delinquency, and organized crime as a way to accomplish their objectives.

Chabat said that drug-trafficking was a more serious problem for Mexico than terrorism. He added that drug-trafficking uses violence to attain financial goals and involves actors without a political agenda. Terrorism, on the other hand, uses violence to achieve political goals, and it can threaten the stability of the state.

Since September 11th, Mexico has been faced with pressure from the United States to guard against international terrorism and to put an end to corruption among Mexican immigration officials, Chabat said. He noted that terrorism will be a long-term problem and said that professionalizing intelligence and law enforcement agencies would be an important step in preventing future terrorist activities.

Carlos Rico, Minister of Public Affairs at the Mexican Embassy in Washington and former Consul General of Boston, also took part in this session. He said that the overlapping interests of the US and Mexico were leading towards unavoidable coordination between the law enforcement and intelligence agencies of the two countries.

Rico said that border control, immigration policy, and intelligence services should be closely integrated. He added that the US-Mexican border was particularly vulnerable, and that it is in Mexico's interest to ensure that no terrorist activities are associated with the border between the countries.

Day 3: Maintaining Reform Efforts while Combating Terrorism

The final day of the program was designed to bring together some of the key topics discussed during the previous two days. While the first day was dedicated to the discussion of internal security reform and ensuring that intelligence and law enforcement agencies function within the rule of law, the second day highlighted the demands on these agencies and efforts made to combat terrorism in Mexico, Peru, and the United States. During the third day of the program, the group drew conclusions from previous discussions and sought to address a very difficult question: *Do counter-terrorism and internal security reform agendas conflict?*

John Coatsworth, Professor of History and Latin American Affairs at Harvard University and Director of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, described the shift in US foreign policy that has taken place since September 11th, and the impact that US policy will have on Latin America in the future.

He said that two debates have been going on in relation to US foreign policy since the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center. While the Bush administration has argued that the post-Cold War era is over and September 11th marks a turning point for US policy, others claim that there is no need for a dramatic shift in policy, as the basic problems that existed before that date remain the same. Coatsworth said the other debate was between isolationists - those concerned with responding to threats and pursuing US interests - and internationalists, who see the need to build international institutions and respect international law.

According to Coatsworth, since the end of the Cold War the US has taken a "hands off" approach to Latin America, and the region has not been at the forefront of its foreign policy agenda. However, in the future we are likely to see more US activism in Latin America and aid to governments facing terrorist threats. He argued that the pressures to combat terrorism will have both positive and negative consequences for the region. Latin American police and intelligence agencies will feel pressure to achieve results, regardless of the human costs. On the other hand, the US has moved to embrace democracy, and it will encourage Latin

American governments to show a commitment to democracy, open and free elections, and the protection of human rights.

Enrique Obando, President of the Political and Strategic Studies Institute in Peru, expressed the opinion that security sector reform need not conflict with counter-terrorism efforts. According to Obando, professional, efficient, and responsible internal security agencies can be helpful in guarding against terrorism. He gave insight into the reform process that is currently taking place in Peru, particularly in regard to the restructuring of the armed forces.

Obando said that a commission named by Prime Minister Danino recently issued a report which called for: strengthening the defense ministry and the joint command, creating a joint doctrine for the armed forces, separating the police from the armed forces, instituting volunteer military service, revising military education curriculum, and ensuring transparency of the military budget.

Obando also described some of the internal problems that Peru is now experiencing that may have an effect on the reform process, as well as the stability of Peru's democratic government. He said that President Toledo's approval ratings are plummeting, and opposition parties are taking steps to destabilize the government. In addition, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) have moved into Peruvian territory. Reports show that this group has been in contact with members of the Shining Path, which has raised fears of an increase in terrorist activity in Peru in the future.

Mexico is currently taking steps to reform its intelligence and security institutions, while it responds to the US's call for greater security, especially at its borders. Raul Benitez Manaut, Professor of International Relations at the National University of Mexico, said that in the 1990s Mexico broke from its isolationist position to create an institutionalized economic link with the United States through the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). With the election of President Fox, Mexico made the political transition to a democratic government. Benitez Manaut said that the third level of integration is in the area of security, and he argued that there should be cooperation between security and intelligence agencies in the US and Mexico.

Benitez noted that Mexican intelligence and law enforcement agencies lack professionalism and respect for human rights, and there is a desire within these agencies to maintain autonomy and nationalistic policy. He said that Mexico should participate actively in the international security system, yet its involvement should be based on consensus within Mexico, rather than on unilateral pressure from the United States.

Conclusions

During the final session, the participants were given an opportunity to make closing remarks and highlight their conclusions and reflections from the previous discussions. Philip Heymann, Faculty Chair of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition and Professor at Harvard Law School, stated that dealing with terrorism will require different strategies, depending on the particular situation. For example, a terrorist group within a specific country, such as Peru, will be dealt with differently than a country that harbors an international terrorist group, like the Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

The impact of US foreign policy and the need to address the underlying roots of terrorism was an issue discussed in depth over the course of the three-day meeting. Enrique Obando Arbulú, President of the Political and Strategic Studies Institute, pointed out that during the post-colonial period, the Arab world looked favorably upon the United States, however the US' support for Arab governments that are viewed as corrupt and the invasion of US secular culture around the world have had a negative impact on the region.

Jorge Chabat, Professor of International Relations at the Center for Economic Research and Teaching in Mexico, said that a less isolationist and reactionary US foreign policy would help change the perspectives of the people and leaders in countries that harbor terrorism. Benedicto Jimenez Bacca, Expert Advisor to the United Nations' Counter-Terrorism Committee, added that the United Nations had a key role to play in combating international terrorism, and he said that an international agreement on combating terrorism was necessary.

Many people said that the meeting had provided a unique opportunity to shed light on issues that were not currently being discussed elsewhere. Kate Martin,

Director of the Center for National Security Studies, noted that the United States had a great deal to learn from the experiences of Latin America, and the lessons learned from Mexico and Peru should be taken into consideration while crafting future counter-terrorism strategies for the United States.

She said that Peru's experiences in dealing with the Shining Path, and in particular with the group's leader Abimael Guzmán, could be very important for helping the US assess appropriate strategies for dealing with Al Qaeda and its leader, Osama Bin Laden. Martin said that since September 11th there have been few, if any, voices from outside of the US discussing counter-terrorism policy in Washington.

A number of the participants said that the program facilitated an evolution in their thought processes, as well as increased understanding about the challenges facing internal security agencies in other countries. Neil Gallagher, former Assistant Director of the FBI, said that prior to the meeting, he would have suggested that the US model of intelligence and law enforcement be

applied to other countries, but he now has a greater appreciation of the differences that exist between countries and the need for unique strategies for each country.

Outcomes of the Program

Based on the written evaluation forms and feedback from the participants, it is clear that the program was an important step in opening up dialogue on the challenging issue of how to combat terrorism while ensuring that internal security agencies respect human rights and operate within the rule of law.

The Project on Justice in Times of Transition is currently assessing a number of possible follow-up options to build upon the discussions that took place during this program. The Project will develop an initiative to assist Peruvian leadership with the process of reforming its intelligence services. This initiative will draw on the insights and experiences of intelligence experts from around the world and give Peruvians feedback on their existing intelligence legislation, as well as strategies for successfully navigating the reform process.

In addition, the Project is considering holding a meeting in Washington with a wider range of practitioners from Latin America and the United States to focus on the issues of counter-terrorism and human rights that were addressed during the *Combating Terrorism* Program.

This report was written by Jenny Ellis,
Program Officer at the Project on Justice in Times of Transition.