

Abstract

This study combines insights from international relations, diplomatic history, and civil-military relations to improve our understanding of the tenuous arrangement between the United States and its foreign military proxies. For over a century, the U.S. has armed and trained these proxies to assume responsibilities that its own military might otherwise have to bear. But throughout that time, critics have doubted whether the U.S. could or should delegate sensitive security responsibilities to “dubious” foreign soldiers. Such doubt highlights an international analog to the principal-agent problem normally associated with domestic civil-military relations. I examine why this international principal-agent problem arose, how it has evolved over the past century, and how this evolution has shifted the U.S.’s approach to bringing its foreign agents in line with its strategic objectives. From extensive archival research, I find that variation in this approach stems from changes in how the U.S., as the principal, has understood and characterized its security agents. To make sense of this finding, I advance constructivist principal-agent theory. This theory 1) reveals how the principal’s evolving perception of its agent defines different bases of the principal-agent problem and 2) shows how each of these bases specifies particular policies—from among all those available—for mitigating that problem.

**THE RISKS OF OUTSOURCING SECURITY:
FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES IN UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY**

By

Eric R. Rittinger

B.A. American University, 2004

M.A. Syracuse University, 2008

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science
in the Graduate School of Syracuse University

Syracuse University
December 2012

UMI Number: 3550380

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3550380

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Copyright 2012 Eric R. Rittinger

All rights reserved

Acknowledgements

There are many people to thank:

Thanks first to my dissertation committee—Audie Klotz, Brian Taylor, Matt Cleary, Mark Rupert, and Patrick Jackson. Audie, my advisor, has been a constant source of support, guidance, and levelheadedness, steadying the ship whenever it strayed into rough waters. Brian offered detailed comments on an earlier draft and encouraged me to run with constructivist principal-agent theory when I was unsure about how to proceed. Matt also offered extensive feedback and has always pushed me to become a better thinker, writer, and researcher. Mark put me in contact with local members of School of the Americas Watch and has shown me how critical theory can enrich our understanding of U.S. foreign policy. Patrick, my undergraduate mentor, recognized that an academic vocation was my calling before I had made that recognition myself; I am grateful not only for his work on methodology, which I use throughout this dissertation, but also for his early confidence in me as a scholar. Finally, I want to thank Anne Mosher for chairing the defense, for taking the time to read the dissertation, and for providing incisive comments.

Thanks to the office staff in the Political Science Department. Candy Brooks, Jacquie Meyer, and Sally Greenfield have been tremendously helpful. The department runs smoothly because of their professionalism and conscientiousness.

Thanks to the archivists at the National Archives, the U.S. Army Heritage and Education Center, the Eisenhower and Reagan Presidential Libraries, and the National Security Archive. Without their expert assistance, I would have been lost amid a sea of texts.

Thanks to all my friends in graduate school. Mike Makara and Deepa Prakash, in particular, have shown me that professional colleagues can also be great friends. I also want to

mention the members of the “Identity Reading Group”—Deepa, Asli Ilgit, Braden Smith, Vlad Kravtsov, and Jooyoun Lee. Audie welcomed me into this group during my second year in the program, and I was fortunate to be able to learn from senior graduate students who shared an interest in constructivist theory and methodology.

Thanks to my family, both extended and immediate. My parents, Cynthia and Richard Rittinger, have been amazingly supportive, offering me refuge at their nearby home in Sodus, New York. My sister, Jill Rittinger-Lytwyne, convinced me to attend college at American University when I was unsure about where to go. Thankfully, I took her advice and found myself at a place where my inchoate interests in IR and politics could take off and bring me to where I am now.

Finally, thanks to my partner, Erica Witz. Her companionship has kept me grounded and has reminded me that there is a world outside of the dissertation. I appreciate her willingness to listen to me go on about writing chapters, revising articles, and applying for jobs—even as she expertly manages her own law school workload. Through the frustrations and the setbacks, she’s been there, offering support, insight, and advice. Amid so many variables, she’s my constant. I dedicate this dissertation to her.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction – The Challenges of Outsourcing Security to Foreign Soldiers	1
Chapter 2 – Alterity and Agency: Finding the Social Basis of the Principal-Agent Problem in the Development of Foreign Security Forces (FSF)	15
Chapter 3 – “He Ain’t No Brother of Mine’: U.S. Resistance and Responses to FSF Development in the Philippines, Dominican Republic, and Haiti, 1899-1934	52
Chapter 4 – Professionalism, Partisanship, and Agency: U.S. FSF Development in the Caribbean Basin, 1899-1933	83
Chapter 5 – Developing FSF in the ‘Developing World’: The U.S. Confronts the Cold War FSF Problem, 1945-1975	121
Chapter 6 – Putting the Moral in ‘Moral Hazard’: Human Rights and FSF Development, 1976-Present	156
Conclusion – U.S. Security Outsourcing: Past, Present, Future	212
References	226
Biographic Data	246

List of Tables and Figures

Figure 1	26
Table 1	40
Discursive Cluster 1	46
Discursive Cluster 2	47
Discursive Cluster 3	48
Discursive Cluster 4	49

Introduction:

The Challenges of Outsourcing Security to Foreign Soldiers

“If we...were not prepared to provide equipment and training needed by others, we would have to be prepared to take the graver step of using U.S. forces to defend our interests” - Lt. General Ernest Graves, director, U.S. Defense Security Assistance Agency (quoted in Shafer 1988: 90)

For over a century, the United States has armed and trained foreign security forces (FSF) to assume responsibilities that its own military might otherwise have to bear. The U.S. began outsourcing military manpower in 1899 when it raised “native” units in the Philippines to help prosecute a counterinsurgency. Similar outsourcing continues today in Afghanistan as the U.S. prepares Afghan security forces to fight the Taliban on their own. But while the goal of substituting foreign soldiers for American soldiers has remained constant over time, the policies for achieving that goal have varied dramatically. Why? I argue that this variation in policy is due to changes in how U.S. policymakers have understood and characterized their security proxies.

The current academic debate overlooks this variation and centers instead on the supposed effects of internationalizing American military manpower. One side argues that it engenders liberal values among foreign soldiers and promotes democracy (Atkinson 2006; Blakeley 2006; Bruneau et al. 2008; Cope 1995). The other side protests that it encourages these soldiers to conduct coups, assassinations, and torture on the U.S.’s behalf (Nelson-Pallmeyer and Bourgeois 1997; Hodge 2004; Gill 2004; McCoy 2005). Both sides presume that foreign fighters necessarily serve some strategic end. But U.S. policymakers and military officers have rarely shared that presumption. Instead, they have treated these fighters as flawed proxies and doubted whether to trust them with arms and training. By dwelling on strategic objectives—whether

spreading democracy or military power—the current debate thus neglects the *tactical* difficulties inherent in delegating security responsibilities to “dubious” foreigners.

I investigate these difficulties by internationalizing the principal-agent problem normally associated with domestic civil-military relations (Feaver 2003; Sowers 2005). Specifically, I apply the principal-agent framework to a “transnational organization of military power,” an organization through which foreign militaries become extensions of the U.S. military, either formally or informally (Barkawi 2006: 47). Instead of treating civilian policymakers as the principal and their own military as the agent, I treat the U.S. (including both civilian and military officials) as the principal and foreign armed forces as the agents. This revised model abstracts from the anxiety expressed by U.S. officials and isolates the defining “problematique” of foreign security force development (Feaver 1996): how do you delegate security responsibilities to foreign soldiers—and thus relinquish some degree of control—but also ensure that they follow your preferred strategy? This analytical move highlights agency costs, the effort required to align an agent’s behavior with the principal’s objectives. By foregrounding these costs, I show why internationalizing military manpower would present U.S. policymakers with tactical problems to be mitigated.

Explaining the existence of agency costs raises questions about why U.S. officials would describe and respond to those costs differently over time. Why, in the early 1900s, did the U.S. rely on its own military officers to command foreign fighters when it could have trained foreign officers for the same job? And why did foreign officers then become “ideal” conduits of U.S. influence after World War II? Why did U.S. policymakers worry about the politicization of the foreign units it raised in the early 20th century, but encourage politicization during the Cold War? Why, moreover, has “socialization” only recently become the preferred method of making

foreign fighters conform to U.S. objectives? Finally, how did the U.S.'s tolerance of illiberal allies during the Cold War transform into an intolerance of security proxies who abused human rights during the 1980s?

Conventional agency theory is unsuited to explain these historical shifts because it posits that the interests of the principal and agent are already in conflict. Its static model bypasses the process by which the principal comes to recognize its agent as a *particular* problem. That process is key, however, because it captures the historical variation both in the principal's definition of the agency problem and in its calculation of the associated agency costs. Analyzing that process in the case of U.S. FSF development reveals that over the past century, American officials have confronted foreign security proxies as distinct *types* of agents: "racial inferiors" and "partisans" when the U.S. expanded its international reach following the Spanish-American War, "nationalists" during the period of decolonization, and "human rights abusers" after the Vietnam War. Each characterization emphasized the alterity of foreign security proxies—which is to say, the otherness of their identities—and implied a specific threat of misbehavior; the specificity of that threat then delimited the range of appropriate policies for averting it. Adopting the principal's perspective in this way advances agency theory by treating the definition of the agency problem as endogenous and empirical, rather than as exogenous and a priori. My ultimate objective is to explicate U.S. FSF development via this theoretical innovation, which I call constructivist principal-agent theory.

There has been surprisingly little attention paid to the challenge of incorporating foreign soldiers into U.S. foreign policy. Several authors touch on this challenge, but fail to take the next step of explaining it. Tarak Barkawi, for example, has written extensively on European efforts to raise competent and reliable imperial forces. He explores how in India, Great Britain found that

“arming and training the colonized to provide security was at once an efficient and risky policy” (2006: 70). He then describes how the British attempted to mitigate these risks by favoring “martial races” and by mixing ethnicities and castes within the ranks. When discussing U.S. security outsourcing, Barkawi describes Latin American militaries as “*imperfect* instruments of U.S. policy,” but never explains what he means by “imperfect” (47, italics added). Instead, he asserts that in “the Third World, the United States exercised even more direct influence over the armed forces of nominally sovereign states” (2006: 47). While he pays close attention to the challenge of incorporating foreign soldiers into British imperial policy, Barkawi fails to acknowledge a similar challenge within U.S. foreign policy, even though he admits that the U.S., like Great Britain, sought to influence foreign militaries in ways that would serve its national interests. What is more, the U.S. has outsourced security responsibilities to foreign militaries from “nominally sovereign states,” which means it cannot claim formal imperial authority over them. Ensuring that their militaries adhere to American security objectives would thus seem a particularly daunting enterprise. By failing to consider that the U.S., like European empires, has confronted the difficulties attendant on outsourcing security, Barkawi ignores an area ripe for analysis.

Similarly, in his discussion of U.S. counterinsurgency training for El Salvador’s military, Frederick Gareau notes the “obvious problems of oversight” caused by putting the “implementation” of counterinsurgency “in the hands of a foreign army” (2004: 41). But he never elaborates the U.S.’s response to those “problems of oversight,” nor does he establish a basis for why this “foreign army” would need oversight in the first place. In his account, Salvadoran soldiers dutifully executed the U.S.’s anti-communist campaign in Central America.

This leaves the reader to wonder why, if this were the case, the U.S. would *need* to expend resources on overseeing them.

Additionally, in her study of the School of the Americas, Lesley Gill notes that the United States “does not entirely trust” the foreign soldiers “on whom [it] depends for cooperation” in Latin America (2004: 8). But she never elaborates that distrust. To the contrary, she suggests that those soldiers serve as reliable tools of the U.S.’s “repressive military apparatus” (2004: 6). These three accounts thus hint at the question of FSF reliability, but never follow through with a sustained answer, even though their own analyses seem to call for one.

While few have paid attention to it, U.S. policymakers have certainly recognized and responded to the challenge of integrating foreign armed forces into American foreign policy. So when Gill calls Latin American military personnel “foot soldiers of U.S. empire” and explains that U.S. military training “encouraged the gradual transformation of the Latin American militaries into accessories of U.S. power and blurred the boundaries that separated the U.S. military from its regional allies,” she neglects how, by characterizing these “regional allies” as particular Others prone to certain misbehaviors, the U.S. first inscribed and defined those boundaries (2004: 59, 237). And when William I. Robinson argues that “military aid created bridges between local forces and the U.S. military” (1996: 80), he fails to acknowledge how that aid was meant to bridge far more than just geographical divides. Like the policymakers themselves, therefore, I depart from these studies and focus on the difficulties—i.e., the “agency costs”—inherent in enlisting foreign fighters within American foreign policy.

I go beyond just focusing on those difficulties, however. I also demonstrate that policymakers have defined those difficulties differently depending on the specific identities attributed to FSF. In other words, as characterizations of FSF have changed over the past

century, so too have the salient agency costs. The U.S. has trained, equipped, advised, assisted, and educated foreign fighters in ways that address the particular costs associated with each characterization.

In the remainder of this introductory chapter, I first offer my critique of the current academic debate over U.S. FSF development. Its fixation on the “ends” of U.S. security outsourcing, I argue, comes at the at the expense of understanding the contested “means” of pursuing such a policy. I then clarify the terms used throughout the dissertation. I conclude by previewing the following chapters.

The Current Debate and the Limitations of Functionalism

The School of the Americas (SOA) opens a window into the current controversy surrounding U.S. security outsourcing. Renamed the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation in 2001, this training center at Fort Benning in Columbus, Georgia brings together cohorts of Latin American military personnel under U.S. military instruction. According to the protests leveled against the school by the School of the Americas Watch (SOAW) and others, SOA trains Latin American soldiers to perform the U.S.’s dirty work. Both activist (Nelson-Pallmeyer and Bourgeois 1997; Hodge et al. 2004) and academic (Gareau 2004; Gill 2004; McCoy 2005) voices accuse it of training Latin American military officers to commit coups against unfriendly regimes, to assassinate labor and church leaders who oppose neoliberalism, and to torture those who threaten the profits of multinational corporations. Defenders of the school have made far more positive, but no less extreme, claims about its transformative curriculum. According to them, the school engenders within its foreign trainees a respect for human rights, civilian supremacy over the military, and democratic routines (Atkinson 2006;

Blakeley 2006). Ostensibly, these trainees transfer this newfound ethos back to their respective militaries and polities.

Both sides of this debate are thus equally functionalist because they both treat the anticipated effect of security outsourcing—socialization towards either illiberalism or liberalism—as its cause. As Carol Atkinson explains, the SOA “has been singled out as an effective but negative socializing influence that promotes authoritarian practices in Latin America. Interestingly, *both sides of the argument hold that socialization takes place*; but differ over the direction of that influence: toward more authoritarian or more liberal practices” (2006: 511, emphasis added). Both FSF advocates and critics describe foreign troops as receptive to American influence. For example, Cope (1995), Bruneau et al (2008) Ruby and Gibler (2010) all argue that U.S. FSF development leads to “liberal practices;” Gareau (2004), Gill (2004) and McCoy (2005) argue the opposite, that it produces illiberal military personnel who violate human rights and who seek to grab political power.

Atkinson (2006) and Ruby and Gibler (2010) adopt a neopositivist approach to this consensus by testing which kind of socialization occurs. I take a different approach, one that remains agnostic as to whether socialization engenders illiberal or liberal values, or whether it engenders anything at all. Rather, I historicize socialization as a rhetorical resource within the discourse of U.S. FSF development. As I discuss in chapters 5 and 6, socialization, a concept introduced into FSF discourse through modernization theory, offered policymakers a means of linking foreign forces with American interests at a time when those forces served their own sovereign states. An especially insidious countermeasure, socialization aims to incorporate foreign troops into the U.S.’s “transnational constitution of force” without material inducements (Barkawi and Laffey 1999: 418). While actual evidence of socialization remains in question, and

while various actors have contested its effectiveness,¹ it nevertheless provides a convenient solution to the problem of delegating security responsibilities to foreigners over whom the U.S. maintains no official authority. By taking as unproblematic this historical artifact, and by reinforcing the characterization of foreign troops as passive receptacles of American influence, the academic literature lends scientific credibility to a particular agency slack countermeasure (as opposed to others). In other words, the literature intervenes in the FSF policy debate and thus becomes implicated in the very phenomenon I seek to investigate. This leads me to mine academic work both for alternative explanations of security outsourcing and for empirical “data points” in the discursive evolution of the FSF agency problem.

The problem with presuming socialization as an effect is that it mistakenly suggests a frictionless relationship between the U.S. and its foreign security proxies. Both sides of the debate argue that the U.S. gets what it wants from these foreigners, so why would American officials question using them? But as my archival research reveals, the officials responsible for outsourcing security have often doubted its benefits, or at least found it rife with uncertainty. When, in 1899, the U.S. first considered recruiting foreign troops to fight its counterinsurgency in the Philippines, such a policy elicited worry from all levels of the military, the War Department, and Congress. Officials wondered whether foreign troops would prove reliable and competent, whether their American handlers could control them, and whether they would turn their newfound weapons and training on those who had armed and trained them. When the U.S. raised constabularies in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua in the early 20th century, it worried that their “ingrained” partisanship would be impossible to reform, and that they would seize political power once American trainers went home. After World War II, the U.S. worried that foreign militaries in the Third World and their respective governments would fall victim to

¹ See, for example Shafer (1988: 96) and Schwarz (1991). I discuss those doubts at length in chapter 6.

communist influence and grow resistant to American authority. And in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, the U.S. worried that foreign military proxies who abused human rights in places like El Salvador and Colombia would “poison the climate” and thwart its strategic goals.

This anxiety over using foreign security proxies contradicts the functionalist idea, so entrenched within the literature, that the U.S. could simply outsource military responsibilities to foreigners as a sure-fire means to its desired ends, whatever those ends might be. To the contrary, U.S. officials have often worried about the unintended consequences of such outsourcing. There has never been a consensus within the U.S. national security establishment that FSF would *necessarily* further its foreign-policy objectives. While the SOAW repeats mantras that the SOA “trains to torture,” U.S. officials have worried about the feasibility, effectiveness, and desirability of training foreign troops to do anything—let alone torture. And while those who defend the school (and other training centers like it) champion its liberalizing effects, policymakers have often worried that arming and training foreign military personnel would in fact empower them to become illiberal autocrats. The internationalizing of American military manpower has shown itself far more tentative than the narrow controversy over SOA would suggest.

Foreign security forces have always presented U.S. policymakers with a tactical challenge, not a readymade solution. Acknowledging this challenge draws our attention to how the U.S. has managed it. How, in other words, has the U.S. hedged itself when delegating security responsibilities to foreigners? As I show in the following chapters, the U.S. has placed American officers in command of FSF units, screened out unwanted personnel, monitored units for the “wrong” behavior, made arms and training conditional on the “right” behavior, and attempted to socialize foreign fighters so that they internalize the desired values. The anticipated

benefits of FSF development—whether the diffusion of military power or the inculcation of liberal values—thus fail to fully explain its implementation in U.S. national security policy. While the expectation of benefits may explain the strategic rationale behind security outsourcing, the potential for particular liabilities explains the U.S.’s shifting approach to that outsourcing over the past century. That approach—varied, tentative, contingent—is what I set to work explaining in this dissertation.

Defining the Terms

In this section I clarify the definitions of “FSF,” “FSF development” and “security outsourcing.” While my interpretive analysis preserves contestation and fluidity, it is analytically important to define concepts and to remain consistent with these definitions. These definitions serve a methodological purpose by directing me to relevant texts and diverting me from those that fall outside the project’s ambit.

First, *FSF*, or in early rhetoric, “native” security forces, are simply non-U.S. personnel who represent a foreign country. They are recruited to act on the U.S.’s behalf, especially within their respective states, whether that recruitment is explicit or implicit. As agents within a principal-agent relationship, these personnel serve as proxies of the U.S. They come from either the military or police and are thus state actors,² through they usually represent states categorized as “quasi,” “developing,” “failing,” “client,” or “puppet.” This definition conforms to the literature on U.S. FSF development, which treats these forces as members of state militaries or police forces. And while Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey characterize the networks formed between the U.S. and local fighters as a “transnational constitution of force,” they acknowledge

² The exception is the Philippine Scouts, which at first constituted units within the U.S. Army. I include U.S. policy debates over the use of the Scouts, however, because the U.S. intended that the Scouts would eventually become independent of the U.S. military and form the nucleus of the Philippine military.

that this force is exerted through the coercive institutions (i.e., the local security forces) of “peripheral” states (1999: 418).

Defining FSF in this way distinguishes my empirical focus from related work on the “delegation of war to rebel organizations” (Salehyhan 2010) or to terrorist organizations (Byman and Kreps 2010). Certainly, the U.S. has engaged in this kind of delegation. It armed the Mujahideen in Afghanistan to fight the Soviets and the Contras in Nicaragua to fight the Sandinistas. But my project, like others within the literature, acknowledges that the U.S. has sought local forces as potential state builders, not state destroyers (Millet 2010: 3). Because it lacks this state-building function, contracting out security functions to non-state entities is a process similar to, but ultimately distinct from, the one I investigate here. I thus limit my analysis to local forces existing within their respective state apparatuses.

Second, *FSF development* covers a range of activity, including the raising, arming, training, educating and/or advising of foreign fighters. In some instances, for example during the Philippine Counterinsurgency (1899-1902), the U.S. built scout and constabulary units from scratch then provided them with uniforms, arms, and doctrine. In other instances, particularly during El Salvador’s civil war (1979-1991), the U.S. merely “advised” and tried (unsuccessfully) to reform the existing military (Schwarz 1991). Such variation, while wide, is nevertheless limited to a single process—that of the U.S. attempting to turn foreigners into proxies of its own military personnel. In the Philippines, that policy deployed local fighters to pacify the U.S.’s new possession; in El Salvador, that policy assisted the Salvadoran military in forestalling a communist takeover. Sometimes, that policy has required raising completely new forces. Other times, the policy has called for “military assistance” to forces already in existence. In either instance, the general objective remains the same even as the approach to realizing that objective

varies. Raising FSF and assisting those forces thus fall into the same category without stretching the concept of FSF development beyond its analytical utility.

Finally, *security outsourcing* contextualizes the international principal-agent problem inherent in the U.S.-FSF relationship. This process involves a state using foreigners to assume some function that its own military personnel would or at least could perform. FSF development is a specific mode of security outsourcing. While this term has recently become a euphemism for enlisting private military contractors (Avant 2004; Singer 2003), I emphasize its connotation with foreign manpower. I thus stay close to its colloquial usage, which refers to firms replacing domestic workers with foreign ones. Just as research in business has investigated the economic challenges of using foreign workers to perform the jobs of a domestic workforce (Aron and Singh 2005; Ellram et al 2008; Vestring 2005), I focus on the difficulties of training and equipping foreign fighters to fulfill roles that the U.S. military would otherwise perform.

The term “outsourcing” is additionally germane because it suggests a hierarchy between the superior outsourcers and the subordinated foreign replacements. It would be difficult to imagine India outsourcing all its call centers to the U.S.; similarly, it would be inconceivable for Afghan Army officers to be training and equipping American soldiers. Security outsourcing takes place between two sides of unequal standing. This definition distinguishes security outsourcing from alliances, which involve “security cooperation between two or more sovereign states” and an “exchange of benefits for both parties” (Walt 1987: 1). That is to say, in alliances, states collaborate as functionally equivalent units, whereas outsourcing involves functionally unequal units. The states from which the U.S. has drawn FSF might enjoy de jure sovereignty but lack de facto sovereignty. This is why Barkawi warns against conflating the two in the context of FSF development. It is wrong to assume, he argues, that Third World states’ “formal,

‘juridical’ (or legal) sovereignty means that they are *actually* sovereign.” Instead, those states find themselves “dependent on superpower patrons,” constrained in their political independence, and exploited for ends that may not be their own (2006: 46-47). As Glassman argues, “in spite of the pretense that the peripheral state’s military is the national institution par excellence it is in fact a significant site of internationalization” (1999: 685). So while foreign soldiers might enjoy professional and instructional benefits by receiving American military equipment and training, there is no reason to assume that that equipment and training necessarily benefits the states that those soldiers represent.

To reiterate, the U.S. has outsourced elements of its security to foreigners as a means of furthering its own national objectives within weak states facing “security deficits” and “an inability to police themselves” (Reveron 2010: 15, 39). Even Derek Reveron, who treats “train and equip” missions as a mutually-beneficial “exporting”—rather than an “outsourcing”—of security, concedes that “underlying all of these activities [associated with security assistance] is the clear intent to achieve U.S. national security objectives” (2010: 105). Since 1899, the main question among policymakers regarding security outsourcing has been: how, if at all, can the hurdles of developing foreign security forces be overcome to make these forces effective instruments of *U.S.* foreign policy? The successful internationalization of American military manpower requires that foreign troops serve American interests.

Empirical Overview

Applying principal-agent theory to the history of U.S. foreign security force development brings to the surface four distinct clusters of policy debates. These clusters, rather than discrete cases of FSF development in particular countries, structure the empirical section (chapters 3-6).

Each cluster characterizes FSF in a specific way, defines the FSF agency problem, and delimits a menu of policy responses. Over the four empirical chapters, I show how each characterization constituted for U.S. policymakers a different challenge to security outsourcing. The specificity of each challenge emerged through the rhetoric of alterity, which raised concerns about arming and training people who are “unlike us” to advance “our” interests. As I show, policymakers were not paralyzed by FSF challenges and the anxiety they produced. Rather, they devised particular responses to meet those challenges—i.e., to cover the relevant agency costs. I thus explain variation in how the U.S. has developed foreign security forces by tracking these four characterizations and the specific definitions of the agency problem they engendered.

In the next chapter, I elaborate my theoretical and methodological approach to the study of U.S. security outsourcing. This approach transcends the constructivist/rationalist divide by blending an interpretive strategy with rational choice theory. The former draws upon postcolonial conceptual tools, which highlight how the discourse of the powerful makes sense of, and attempts to control, the foreign Other. The latter draws from agency theory, which involves the delegation of authority under uncertain conditions. Both are about the challenges of getting others to do what you want them to do. Together, they create the framework for constructivist principal-agent theory, which ultimately allows me to explain the U.S.’s varied, tentative approach to the development of foreign security proxies over the past century.

Chapter 2:

Alterity and Agency: Finding the Social Basis of the Principal-Agent Problem in the Development of Foreign Security Forces (FSF)

Introduction

I use this chapter to elaborate constructivist principal-agent theory and to demonstrate its analytical utility for the study of U.S. foreign security force development. This theory 1) unearths the social basis of preference divergence in the agency relationship and 2) links that basis to the principal's perception and payment of agency costs. Innovating agency theory in this way extracts the agency problem from its putatively rationalist domain and embeds it within a social context. Within that context, the generation of divergent identities precedes assumptions about divergent preferences. This analytical shift enriches our theoretical understanding of agency. More importantly, it produces new insights into why and how the U.S. has hedged its position on developing foreign security proxies over the past century. We have much to learn about the principal-agent problem in general and U.S. foreign security force (FSF) development in particular by "historiciz[ing] and rehumaniz[ing] *homo economicus*" (Alker 1996: 328).

In the following sections, I first outline conventional agency theory and the criticisms leveled against it. I argue that a constructivist reworking of agency theory can address those criticisms and offer an improved means of analyzing agency relationships. Second, I elaborate how a constructivist principal-agent theory advances extant debates in IR between constructivism and rationalism. Third, I show how this theoretical innovation goes beyond conventional agency theory in explaining contestation within U.S. programs for outsourcing military manpower. Finally, I connect this theoretical approach to a corresponding methodology,

one that can trace the transformation of meaning and practice within the principal-agent relationship.

Conventional Agency Theory and Its Critics

To learn about the principal-agent problem is to see its ubiquity across social, economic and political settings.³ Conventionally defined, agency relationships involve formal or informal contracts made under conditions of asymmetric information. The principal delegates some degree of authority to the agent, which then becomes responsible for working on the principal's behalf. But the agent knows its⁴ intentions and behavior better than the principal—hence the information asymmetry. As a result, the principal must devise ways of ensuring that the agent fulfills its obligations, despite the temptation and opportunity for it to do otherwise (Spremann 1987: 3). Given that the principal and agent want to maximize their respective utilities, the latter's pursuit of its self-interest typically comes at the expense of fulfilling its obligations to the former. "Agency slack" denotes the potential of the agent to engage in behaviors unwanted by the principal. In response, the principal designs selection criteria, audits, incentives, and punishments as countermeasures to agent misbehavior. These countermeasures, plus the slippage between the agent's behavior and the principal's objectives, reflect "agency costs" (Schneider 1987: 483). Such costs speak to the challenges of relying on others to advance one's own self-interest. Ultimately, agency theory concerns "relationships of 'acting for' or control in complex systems." The tenuousness of these relationships forces agency theory to follow "the production,

³ For overviews of agency theory in economics, sociology, and political science, see Shapiro 2005; Miller 2005; Wright et al. 2001.

⁴ Because I treat principals and agents as corporate entities, not necessarily just individuals, I refer to them using the neutral pronoun.

the persistence, and the amelioration of failures in service and control” (Mitnick, quoted in Shapiro 2005: 274-275).

Critics have rightly highlighted the limitations of this conventional principal-agent story. Ethicists and sociologists, in particular, have faulted agency theory for its reliance on dubious assumptions about rational self-interest (Duska 1992; Koford and Penno 1992), for its compression of complex organizations into dyads (Shapiro 2005: 267), and for its treatment of “guileful” agents (Perrow 1986; Dees 1992). Such criticisms reflect a general dissatisfaction with an economism that evacuates the principal-agent problem of sociological significance.

I rework conventional agency theory so that it can become as “profoundly sociological” as its critics have wanted it to be (Shapiro 2005: 263). But to do so, I first recognize that conventional agency theory derives its usefulness from its incomplete, rationalist model of reality. This simplicity is an analytical benefit because it marks a starting point for empirical analysis. As Kenneth Waltz argues, theories are intentionally simplified models—ideal-types—that distil order from the complexity of social life. “Reality,” writes Waltz, “is complex; theory is simple.” And so, “rather than being a mirror in which reality is reflected, [theory] is an instrument to be used in attempting to explain a circumscribed part of reality of whose true dimensions we can never be sure” (1997: 913-914). Criticizing the falsificationist approach promulgated in King et al. (1994), Waltz explains how a model “is of no use if it does little more than ape the complexity of the world” (1997: 914).

Testing agency theory against some external reality would thus be misdirected. As a theory, it *intentionally* fails to replicate the messiness of an actual agency relationship (Jackson 2011: 154).⁵ Criticisms of agency theory that call for more empirical testing or note the “mixed

⁵ This non-standard interpretation of Waltz follows from Jackson, who argues that Waltz’s *Theory of International Politics* has been “profoundly *misunderstood* in essential respects” (2011: 112; see also 112-114).

results” of tests already performed misread the purpose of a theoretical model (see, for example, Dees 1992: 29). Agency models certainly neglect real-life aspects of the principal-agent relationship. As Clarke and Primo argue, models are supposed to do just that, because their value is measured by whether they serve some purpose, not by whether they conform to reality (2012). In certain circumstances, for instance, principals and agents show altruism, yet the models hold fast to assumptions about self-directed behavior (Kofman and Lawarree 1994: 118).

Paradoxically, empirical variations from the model become theoretically significant precisely because the model neglected them in the first place. As Jackson argues, ideal-types call attention to their limitations when applied to the empirical record (2011: 154). For example, Weber’s charismatic authority ideal-type can become unsustainable once the charismatic leader confronts the difficulties of actually governing; Waltz’s own balancing ideal-type sometimes fails to materialize even when his structural realist theory would expect it (as Vazquez [1997] points out). These are not faults of the models, but advantages, because they clarify gaps, inconsistencies, and puzzles. As Waltz says, “theories lay bare the essential elements in play and indicate necessary relations of cause and interdependency—or *suggest where to look for them* (1997: 913, emphasis added). A sparse agency model sets the stage for case-specific explanation.

The ideal-typification of agency uncovers conceptual space for the social relations that conventional principal-agent theory neglects. That is, the economism of this conventional approach discloses sociological lacunae. Applying agency theory to the outsourcing of U.S. security responsibilities reveals an important but simple piece to the agency puzzle: the *social basis* of the agency problem. While DeGeorge argues that one “of the strengths of agency theory is its recognition of and ability to deal with relations” (1992: 59), it actually fails to provide a compelling rationale for why those relations should necessarily be tenuous. Besides some

exogenously presumed tendency to shirk or disobey, what exactly about agents makes them imperfect proxies? More specifically, why do agents strike principals as worrisome? And how can we link these worries to the principal's choice of agency slack countermeasures?

Answering these questions requires analyzing agency costs from the principal's perspective. This move highlights instances in which the principal recognizes its agent *as a* problem. How the principal actually evaluates the agent is crucial, because it substantiates and contextualizes an abstract concern with entrusting others to act on your behalf. According to the principal, what is the likelihood that a given agent will misbehave? And what kind of misbehavior will it likely engage in? While conventional agency theory neglects the principal's own point of view, I foreground it, because it concretizes the agency problem. In practice, the principal supplies reasons to explain why an agent's reliability remains in doubt. Those reasons are grounded in the qualities that distinguish the agent from the principal, qualities that mark the agent as an imperfect stand-in. A person "unlike us," lacking our shared purpose and background, cannot be expected to automatically serve "our interests." In my revision of agency theory, therefore, the construction of heterogeneous identities—as defined by the principal—gives rise to the heterogeneous interests at the heart of the agency problem.

The conventional specification of this problem seems ripe for revision, as it relies on a tautological notion of agent "type" (Petersen 1993: 280; Koford and Peno 1992: 131-139). Petersen explains that the principal attempts to find the "right kind of agent, that is, the more desirable type." And Salehyan warns of "adverse selection" and the "risks [of] choosing inferior" agents (2010: 502). But what makes one prospective agent desirable and another "inferior"? This question bedevils conventional agency theory because it calls for concrete rather than abstract answers. It resists the categorical response that principals simply desire ethical agents who share

their preferences. While it is conceivable that principals would desire ethical agents—since they would be less likely to lie, shirk, or exploit their newfound authority for personal gain—it is equally conceivable that principals could prefer unethical agents, especially when the principal wants unethical behavior performed on its behalf (Miller 1992: 134-135). In addition, saying that the desirable agent shares its principal’s preferences gives little practical information, because the principal can never completely know the agent’s individual preferences; this after all is the crux of the agency problem. The principal can only guess during the selection phase as to how well the prospective agent will fulfill its obligations. Screening procedures, which have to be based on some preexisting criteria anyway, can only provide imperfect indicators of an agent’s future performance. And the principal still “relies on imperfect surrogate measures” to gauge actual performance once the agent has begun its duties (Mitnick 1992: 79). It is clear that equating type with ethical character or with expected performance offers an unsatisfying account of the basis on which principals evaluate, select, and then monitor their agents. Conventional agency theory thus fails to establish non-tautological, practical guidelines for determining an agent’s reliability.

This thin conception of agent type indicates where the conventional model could benefit from revision. Specifically, it begs for an inductive analysis of how principals confront the liabilities and costs of delegating authority to others. To compare the thin conception of type with an empirical case, I examine how U.S. officials have described foreign security proxies over the past century. As a way of justifying doubts about their proxies’ reliability, these officials have referenced some essential characteristics of their proxies’ identity. At different historical periods, these characterizations of FSF have emphasized their racial inferiority, partisanship, foreign nationalism, and illiberal abuses of human rights. Each characterization has directly

informed how the principal understands and calculates agency costs. Applying the conventional model to this case thus exposes how a thin notion of agent type oversimplifies the process by which principals gauge their agents. That oversimplification impoverishes the conventional model, because it denies a role for the principal's own judgment. To enrich the model, I recast agent type as agent identity, i.e., as the group quality attributed to the agent by the principal. When the principal associates this group quality with certain behaviors relevant to its interests, it contextualizes the agent's propensity to behave or misbehave and offers guidelines for determining what exactly makes an agent more or less reliable. Understanding agent type as agent identity sets in motion a sociological analysis of the agency problem.

Highlighting the social foundations of the agency problem establishes a non-tautological means of explaining the principal's anxiety over agent misbehavior. Conventional agency theory, on the other hand, holds that agents, by pursuing their own rational self-interest, will stray from what the principal wants. As Salehyan explains, "principals and their agents are likely to have some divergent interests" (2010: 502). This is plausible, but underdetermined. Similarly, Mitnick claims that the "agent and principal are supposed to have potentially differing preferences," but why should that necessarily be the case (1992: 73)? Assuming at the onset that agents engage in actions undesired by their principals forecloses any analysis of why those actions would occur or, more precisely, of why principals would worry about them occurring. How does agency slack, an abstract concept, play out in the real world? Instead of treating agent misbehavior as a necessary assumption, the researcher should investigate what makes the agent so worrisome. Mitnick hints at this when he asks, "What are the characteristic problems of agency?" (1992: 95). Generating substantive answers to that question requires close attention to the social milieu in which agency problems develop. Conventional agency theory is unsuited for such a task, because

it “exogenously” specifies the preference divergence between principal and agent (Adams 1996: 14). A constructivist approach to agency theory, however, focuses on how this divergence develops *endogenously* within the principal-agent relationship. Such an approach treats this divergence as an empirical question rather than as an a priori assumption. By pinpointing the particular, not general, dangers that an agency relationship poses, it shows why principals would recognize their preferences as distinct from those of their agents. In doing so, it traces the particular construction of “goal incongruity” between principal and agent and thus establishes the social basis of the agency problem.

Focusing on the principal’s characterizations of its agent provides an unorthodox response to Duska, who challenges the dominant assumption, originally made by Jensen and Meckling (1976), that “the agent will not always act in the best interest of the principal.” Duska wants to know, “what are those good reasons? When won’t the agent act in the best interests of the principal” (1992: 151)? While Duska probably seeks covering law statements about which organizational structures or incentive schemes would most effectively secure agent compliance, his questions open the door to the answers provided by the principals themselves. Instead of offering the general proposition that, for example, “shared ethnicity eases the burdens of delegation” (Salehyan 2010: 509), constructivist principal-agent theory would direct the researcher to examine what, from the principal’s perspective, eases or exacerbates those burdens. This is not to say that the principal possesses objective information about how best to control agent behavior. Indeed, the principal could very well misjudge its agents and design ineffective countermeasures. But while the principal may not always know its agent, it has to treat that agent as knowable. The principal-agent relationship compels the principal to figure out, and then respond to, the agency problem. Achieving its objectives through delegation requires the

principal to identify why delegation might prove hazardous. It becomes important, therefore, to examine what the principal worries about. How are those worries legitimized? And why and how do they change? Ultimately, the principal must confront and respond to the costs incurred by attempting to control others. To do so, the principal socially constructs specific knowledge about its agents and acts *as if* it were an objective appraisal of agency costs.

Critics calling for revisions to agency theory have also sought better theorization of the linkage between the problem an agent poses and the principal's plan for mitigating it.

Conventional agency theory under-specifies the reasons why principals would choose particular countermeasures over others. For instance, Salehyan lists three main countermeasures available to principals: "screening and selection mechanisms, monitoring, and sanctioning" (2010: 505). But which definition of the agency problem matches which countermeasure? "Ideally," writes Mitnick, "we should aim for a theory of agency problem remediation in which particular coping strategies are linked to particular agency problems" (1992: 95). While conventional agency theory examines how principals design organizational structures, compliance mechanisms, and "reward rules" to limit agent misbehavior and opportunism (Petersen 1993: 280), it has so far failed to connect the specificity of the principal's worry to the means of alleviating it.

Constructivist principal-agent theory takes up this challenge by linking the principal's anxiety over agent misbehavior to its choice of agency slack countermeasures. If we want to know why the principal chooses certain "coping strategies" over others, it behooves us to explore the anxiety that originally animated the principal's response. In this way, certain strategies become appropriate when the principal can legitimize them as effective correctives to the specific "goal incongruity" implied by the agent's identity. This process of legitimizing allows for contestation over which strategies would prove most effective. A sociological approach to the


agency problem thus investigates how the implementation of agency slack countermeasures is conditioned by the principal's definition of that problem. In this approach, the principal becomes dynamic and creative, adapting to the particular agency costs at hand. Exerting control over the agent becomes an exercise in countermeasure customization. What does an agent's identity tell the principal about its expected behavior, its propensity to fulfill obligations, or its capacity to share the principal's worldview? Which countermeasures, or combination of countermeasures, best address those questions? Ultimately, we can generate better accounts of the principal's choice of "coping strategies" by investigating the calculations of agency costs that informed it.

So far, constructivist agency theory would seem to perpetuate the "normative bias in favor of the principal" (Dees 1992: 36). Such a bias should come as no surprise, given that the principal confronts the primary puzzle of delegating authority to others while pursuing its self-interest. Jones describes this inequitable arrangement as one in which "one or more individuals, the agents, are subordinate to and supposed to act on behalf of one or more others, the principals" (quoted in Dees 1992: 36). As Dees notes, the "principal's interests drive the model and determine the shape of the contract that results" (1992: 35). Simply put, the principal-agent model centers on the former attempting to control the latter. Perrow (1986) argues that this bias is both "conservative" and "dangerous." According to him, we should redirect our attention to the agent and the exploitation it might endure at the hands of opportunistic principals. Dees shares this view. He explains how conventional treatments of agency theory tend to "ignore the principal's obligations to the agent" and to encourage "excessive distrust and disrespect for agents" (1992: 35). And Duska invites us to acknowledge the difficulties faced by the agent in reconciling its own rational self-interest with the "self-sacrificing behavior necessary for agency" (1992: 144).

While I agree that the agent's perspective remains understudied, there is still much to learn by (analytically) prioritizing the principal. Specifically, adopting the principal's point of view implicates the principal's dominant discourse in the definition of the agency problem. Within this approach, the specification of agency problems becomes contingent upon the biases, passions, tropes, and other rhetorical resources that happen to be salient among principals at a given time and place. That specification also becomes embroiled within intra-discursive debates, as chapter six demonstrates. Saliency, moreover, need not mean internalization. One could suppose, for example, that U.S. policymakers and military planners personally disagreed with the protests carried out by School of the Americas Watch over the human rights abuses committed by SOA graduates. But by de-legitimizing the delegation of military responsibilities to human rights abusers, the protests nevertheless managed to make FSF a liability for the U.S. government. Principals become embedded within—and thus limited by—their historical situation as they grapple to understand their agents and the most suitable ways of exploiting them. The calculation and payment of agency costs become historical events carried out by *homo sociologicus* rather than the automated responses of *homo economicus*. Hardly “conservative,” this analytical position frees the agency problem from its ahistorical confines. By allowing historically situated human beings, rather than the researcher, to define the specificity of this problem, constructivist principal-agent theory historicizes worries about agency slack. To be precise, principals do not define into existence the possibility that their agents would engage in unwanted behaviors—that possibility is built into the structure of the relationship itself. But they do construct the social basis of that possibility by drawing upon their cultural apparatus to evaluate the prospect and practice of authority delegation.

I include below a schema of constructivist principal-agent theory:

Figure 1:



Postcolonialism and the International Principal-Agent Problem

My reworking of conventional agency theory turns ethical concerns about hierarchy, exploitation, and the primacy of the principal's perspective into an opportunity to reexamine cultural tension within international principal-agent problems.⁶ I seize this opportunity by integrating the postcolonial notion of alterity into my analytical framework. This notion recasts the relationship between principal and agent as one between Self and Other. It pushes the conventional model to capture the range of power relations acting on the agent, from blatant coercion to the "heteronomous relations pervasive in situations of exchange" (Onuf and Klink 1989: 151). And, most significantly, it shows how the principal-agent dynamic can both inscribe

⁶ As economists have pointed out, the principal-agent relationship need not always be hierarchical; it could also operate as a "team." The agent could even occupy a superior position relative to the principal (Spremann 1987: 9). But because I take the principal's point of view, which is devoted towards rendering the agent an instrument of its will, I maintain this principal-agent hierarchy. I discuss the reasons for this further below.

and transect international boundaries. I describe this dual process of inscribing and transecting below.

Constructivist principal-agent theory, attuned to hierarchy and asymmetry, responds to the critique made by Inayatullah and Blaney in their ethnography of the IR discipline, which indicts IR for its “failure...to confront the problem of cultural difference” (2004: 3). Such difference figures prominently within a sociological account of international agency. Specifically, it emerges from the principal’s characterization of its “foreign” agent. By invoking the alterity of the agent, the principal inscribes boundaries between them and crystallizes their respective identities. For the principal, these boundaries signify hindrances to an agent’s compliance; they represent agency costs, the flaws that make the agent an imperfect proxy. While conventional principal-agent theory deals with difference, it is a difference calculated only by conflicting self-interests. A constructivist agency theory explores difference at the level of divergent, hierarchical identities. And so, alterity adds to the conception of agent type; it casts that type as both different from *and inferior to* the principal. In this way, alterity further elucidates the content and structure of the agency relationship.

Mitigating the agency problem across cultural divides involves what Inayatullah and Blaney describe as the “double movement.” Drawing explicitly from Todorov (1984) and implicitly from Said (1979) and Derrida (1982), Inayatullah and Blaney describe the confrontation of cultural difference as a two-stage process by which “difference becomes inferiority, and the possibility of a common humanity requires assimilation” (2004: 10). Because the principal seeks control over the agent, it must manage the uncertainty of the principal-agent relationship and overcome the differences that hinder the efficient delegation of authority. The principal’s objective is to minimize agency costs to the point where delegation can advance its

interests (whatever they might be) more than hinder them. This is no easy task, especially since the agent can always make trouble for the principal. “Because of the information asymmetry and goal incongruity inherent in the principal-agent relationship,” Dees explains, “the principal is especially vulnerable to exploitation by the agent” (1992: 36). Similar to colonizers’ attempts at “getting the ‘natives’ to work” (Doty 1996: 51), the principal works to discipline “guileful” and “opportunistic” agents into “more efficient performers of [its] wishes” (Mitnick 1992: 76). The energy expended on disciplining agents—what Inayatullah and Blaney would consider the hegemonic pursuit of “sameness” and what agency theory would refer to as covering agency costs—may merely coerce agents into compliance. But a more Foucauldian exercise of discipline may also induce within agents a volitional identification with the principal’s interests (Foucault 1979). In either case, the principal endeavors to collapse agent alterity into docility, controllability, even similarity. By overcoming “goal incongruity,” the principal can ensure that the agent fulfills its obligations (Dees 1992: 28). Paradoxically, therefore, the principal’s initial invocation of alterity transitions into a rejection of difference.

Mitigating the principal-agent problem implies that the principal can envision the possibility of a compliant agent. Difference cannot completely impede the delegation of authority. While perfectly efficient delegation may prove impossible, managing the agent must remain a possibility for the principal-agent relationship to benefit the principal. O’Hagan articulates this logic within the Self/Other dichotomy, albeit outside of the agency context. “The values of the other may appear remote,” she explains, “but this does not necessarily mean that they are incompatible or incommensurable with those of the self” (2004: 40). O’Hagan’s view, expressed as a call to intercultural “understanding” and “respect,” champions the possibility of “commonalities” between Self and Other. But it downplays the central insight from Todorov and

Said, namely, that the Self's knowledge of the Other can serve as an instrument of physical and cultural conquest. Such insights offer sharp warnings for the principal-agent problem, given its emphasis on control, compliance, and congruity. Within a hierarchical, Self/Other relationship, commonality should never be confused with equality, especially between principals and agents, where "congruity" means only that the latter conforms to the goals and values of the former.

IR Constructivism and Agency Theory

While the hierarchical, Self/Other dichotomy of the principal-agent relationship fits well with post-colonialism, such a dichotomy calls for a revised interpretation of IR constructivism. Constructivism holds that rules are both regulative and constitutive; that agency and structure are co-constitutive; and that knowledge emerges through an intersubjective, rather than subjective or objective, process (Fierke and Jorgensen 2001; Kubalkova et al. 1998; Klotz and Lynch 2007). My approach, however, intentionally avoids an intersubjective analysis of the relationship between principal and agent. While such an analysis is possible (as I discuss in the conclusion), there exist analytical grounds for restricting the domain of intersubjectivity to the principal's constitutive actors. The principal-agent relationship, as described above, does not involve coequal, functionally equivalent subjects. The principal and the agent do not meet and interact as "ego and alter" (Wendt 1999); they are not "preexisting international subjects with fixed identities" (Doty 1996: 48). Rather, they emerge within a field already structured by power relations, which define the principal-agent relationship as one in which the former acts on the latter. The existence of an agency problem, however defined, presupposes that the principal must contain an agent's misbehavior. By definition, the principal treats the agent instrumentally as a means to its own ends. An agent has to surrender some level of independence. Well-behaved

agents thus lack agency. As Barkin notes, the “agent of principal-agent theory, who is expected to act in a predictable way in response to given incentives, is not an agent in the constructivist sense” (2010: 107). Constructivist principal-agent theory, designed to highlight inequity, qualifies the agent’s subjectivity and acknowledges that it exists as an object to be acted upon. I would submit that the relationship between a subject and an object, as I describe it here, fails to qualify as intersubjective.

I thus focus instead on the intersubjective construction of the agency problem among the actors who constitute the principal. The ambit of this constructivist analysis is consistent with approaching the agency problem from the principal’s point of view. The principal refers here to the multiple actors charged with delegating authority and with devising ways of preventing agents from abusing that authority. Those who are not directly responsible for decisions on delegation can still define the agency problem by shaping the discourse in which that definition emerges. An intersubjective analysis of the principal’s constitutive actors examines the legitimization or de-legitimization of delegation and the rhetorical resources deployed in doing so. Such an analysis still frames the construction of the agency problem as a contingent, intersubjective process, but one animated by the *principal’s* collective discourse.

The constructivist label is additionally appropriate when considering how a hierarchical principal-agent relationship demonstrates the regulative and constitutive function of rules. Indeed, this hierarchy develops through rules, which, as Onuf explains, regulate and constitute actors and their social arrangements. To use Onuf’s pithy formulation, “Rules create rule” (1998: 63). In this case, those rules establish the “ruled character of international relations” (Onuf and Klink 1989: 169). By recognizing that the principal-agent relationship emerges through rules, we gain a better understanding of what threatens that relationship and what harmonizes it. The

principal fears that the agent will break the rules of that relationship. Flouting those rules would increase agency costs, intensify the agency problem, and perhaps foreclose the very possibility of authority delegation. At the same time, following those rules would fortify the structure of the relationship by producing different forms of agency. For the principal, agency refers to the capacity to act, particularly the capacity to act on the agent in the pursuit of goals. For the agent, however, agency refers to its obligations to its principal. Principals are able to police those rules and determine when an agent has violated them, but only because the rules cast the principal in this superior position. When agents follow the rules, they perpetuate the disparity in types of agency, since fulfilling obligations means conceding to the principal's authority. As Onuf and Klink explain, the "expectations that rules engender are always differential, and arrangements of rules must always be one of super- and subordination" (1989: 156). The rules of agency perpetuate hierarchy because they regulate conformity with the principal's goals and constitute agents as subordinate players.

Attention to the rules of agency can also bring to light the context-dependent rationality of the principal's seemingly irrational behavior. Humanizing *homo economicus* need not, as some rational-choice theorists might contend, entail a turn towards irrationality, but rather toward a rationality oriented around operative rules. As Onuf explains, "acting to achieve goals is *rational* conduct and agents faced with choices will act rationally. Viewed from the outside, these choices may appear to be less than rational, but this is due to the complexities of agency and human fallibility" (1998: 60). When principals delegate authority, they confront a set of rules for covering agency costs. Given the social context, following these rules may call for conduct or reasoning that strikes outside observers as irrational. For example, to exert control over "racially inferior" foreign security forces at the beginning of the 20th century, U.S. officials officered

foreign units with “racially superior” white Americans. The logic appears dubious when evaluated by today’s standards, given that racial hierarchies no longer constitute appropriate schemes of classification. We of course know that “whiteness” is no correlate of military leadership potential. But from the perspective of U.S. military planners in the early 1900s, educated as they were by scientific racism, the “whiteness” of American officers rendered them an effective, rational means of monitoring and exploiting “native” security forces.

The constructivist assumption that agency and structure are “mutually constituted” allows rules to change over time. As Klotz and Lynch explain, “people are both socialized into their situations and capable of transformative actions” (2007: 59). For instance, after World War II, racial hierarchy became far less explicit when policymakers discussed FSF development. The rules for paying the agency costs of delegating authority followed this discursive shift. In the previous era, the prospect of “native” officers elicited derision, because the U.S. considered such officers biologically or politically incapable of using their authority to advance its interests. In this era, however, policymakers drew from modernization theory and began to characterize foreign officers as the paragon of Third World modernity. This made it rational, therefore, to expend resources on training and indoctrinating foreign officers within the U.S. and abroad. In both eras, the goal was to exert influence over foreign security forces so that they would serve American foreign policy. The operative rules, however, shifted as U.S. officials attributed different identities to those foreign forces. In this way, the rational pursuit of that same goal called for different—even contradictory—strategies.

Finally, applying constructivism to the principal-agent problem transcends the “major line of contestation” within the rationalist/constructivist debate (Price and Reus-Smit 1998: 263). To go beyond this debate, I draw inspiration from Hayward Alker’s critique of the rationalism

within prisoner's dilemma games. Taking a "dramaturgical" and "performative" approach to these games, Alker explains the purpose of "narratively sensitive" research on putatively economic problems: "Experimental games are not considered as tests of unreal models; they have been redescribed as episodic, lesson-suggesting, monad-like dramas abstracted from a larger historical world which they microscopically reflect." Like Waltz, Alker rejects testing analytical models. But Alker takes this position further. He elaborates how the benefits of these models are "possible because we have refused, pseudo-scientifically, to treat social scientific 'subjects' in experimentally isolated contexts as devoid of history, culture, language and previous human experience" (1996: 328). Alker aims to embed the atomistic rational utilitarian within a specific time and place while maintaining the model's basic framework, at least at the beginning. From there, he encourages the researcher to examine empirical variations from the model, to attempt to account for those variations, to explore the analytical tensions, and to make revisions for improved empirical analysis.

This approach stands in stark contrast to the quest for a "bridge" between rationalism/materialism and constructivism/idealism. Champions of this "middle ground" include Checkel, who notes that the "goal is to develop scope conditions that help better to predict when rationalist or constructivist dynamics will prevail" (1997: 488). Similarly, Wendt explains that, "treating ideas and material conditions as separate but inevitably linked phenomena is a way of disentangling their respective effects" (2000: 167). And Adler seeks a "middle ground" for constructivism that negotiates between and accounts for the distinct, yet continuously interacting, material and ideational worlds (1997).

But the quest for the middle ground becomes self-defeating as a constructivist enterprise. Negotiating between rationalism/materialism and constructivism/idealism turns an ostensible

compromise into an analytical muddle. It is tempting to concede that ideas matter when material things do not matter, or that people act rationally when they are not acting according to values. Indeed, within agency theory, critics seek to identify agents who offset their selfish opportunism “with situation-specific ethical behavior” (Koford and Peno 1992: 136). But when each side becomes a comprehensive worldview, compromise offers little potential for productive integration. As worldviews, they come with self-contained ontologies. A dogmatic rationalist could always say that, ultimately, every action is rational, even those that seem altruistic, because even altruism provides psychological payoffs. Similarly, a dogmatic constructivist could argue that rationality is itself value-laden. A strict idealist could claim, moreover, that ideas are all we have, while a strict materialist could say that ideas are just the byproducts of brain matter. Combining these ontological commitments fails to get us any closer to a complete picture about how the world works. Rather, it makes for inconsistent analytical models that make reality at once material and ideational and people at once slaves to their utility functions and to their cultural scripts.

More importantly, the “middle ground” betrays a methodological concession to falsificationism. For proponents of this *via media*, integrating rationalism with constructivism and materialism with idealism is promising because it establishes the theoretical complexity necessary to represent more of reality. Likewise, falsificationism seeks theoretical complexity so that it can withstand ever more empirical tests. “Theory,” write King et al. “should be just as complicated as our evidence suggests” (1994: 20). Constructivism, however, joins Waltz in rejecting falsification as a necessary or even appropriate technique. While Waltz treats falsification as a misreading of theory, constructivism treats it as a misuse of the intersubjective nature of reality. As Klotz and Lynch explain, because “constructivist ontology rejects the notion

of an objective reality against which analysts test the accuracy of interpretations, ‘falsifiability’ cannot be the goal” (2007: 106; see also Jackson 2008). For both Waltz and constructivists, theory and reality intertwine into a “monist” ontology (Jackson 2011). And yet, efforts to settle the rationalism/constructivism debate have sought to turn constructivism into a better mirror of reality, capable of reflecting norms and ideas as well as it reflects interests and material stuff. This “middle ground” thus surrenders its constructivist ontology by moving towards the “mind-world dualism” that falsification requires (ibid).

This push to complicate theory works at cross-purposes with the analytical logic of constructivist principal-agent theory. My resistance to the “middle ground” is not, as it is for Zefuss (2002), a political stand against the imposition of limits, but rather a methodological stand in favor of internally-consistent analytical models. These models, writes Jackson, are “specialized conceptual filters that focus our scholarly attention on particular aspects of actually existing things to the detriment of other aspects of those same things” (2011: 145). They cannot account for everything if they are “specialized,” and any attempt at making them account for everything will just leads to inconsistencies. Hence I agree with Fearon and Wendt, who argue that the “most fruitful framing of ‘rationalism v. constructivism’ is a pragmatic one, treating them as analytical lenses for looking at social reality” (2002: 68). Instead of conflating ontological commitments, therefore, we should revise and refine models in ways that produce novel or unexpected knowledge about some phenomenon of interest. To that end, I recast the rationalist/constructivist divide as an opportunity to apply Alker’s “humanistic” sensibility to a setting usually reserved for rational-choice modeling. The constructivist principal-agent model replaces *homo economicus* with *homo sociologicus* and investigates the resulting implications. What happens when we “re-humanize” the actors who delegate authority to others? What do we

gain from this model that the conventional model neglects? In the next section, I use the internationalization of U.S. military manpower as the setting in which to explore those very questions.

Constructivist Principal-Agent Theory and the Outsourcing of U.S Military Manpower

The capacity to reveal something new is the test of any theoretical advance.

Constructivist principal-agent theory must therefore do more than address the criticisms of conventional agency theory, assert the importance of identity in the principal-agent relationship, or examine “the manifest political consequences of adopting one mode of representation over another” (Campbell 1998: 4). The point is not to mirror more of reality—as if reality existed apart from the theoretical lens through which we view it—but rather to bring new features of that reality into focus.⁷ In other words, constructivist principal-agent theory serves my “pragmatic explanatory goals,” which include explaining some feature of U.S. FSF development not captured by the conventional principal-agent model or by competing functionalist accounts of that development (Jackson 2011: 143).

My revised model accomplishes these goals by foregrounding alterity and its role in defining the social basis of the FSF agency problem. By highlighting that basis and its evolution over time, constructivist principal-agent theory traces variation in the sources of agency slack, which in turn follows variation in the design of countermeasures. Through constructivist principal-agent theory, therefore, I am able to reveal why and how the U.S. has hedged its delegation of security responsibilities to foreigners over the past century.

⁷ As mentioned above, a “monist” ontology precludes testing, because there is no mind-independent reality against which to test one’s claims (Jackson 2011).

Conventional principal-agent theory still provides a useful starting point. When applied to the history of U.S. foreign security force development, it isolates instances in which U.S. policymakers expressed worries about the reliability and effectiveness of foreign security proxies. It also isolates the efforts of these policymakers to bring foreign soldiers in line with U.S. security interests. The job of connecting those worries and responses comes later, but for now, it is just important to see how four distinct clusters of FSF policy debates come into sharp relief over the past century. Each of these four clusters captures a distinct definition of the agency problem.

From here, I go beyond the conventional model and examine the *content* of these four debates. What animates them? How are they resolved? How does the U.S. principal characterize its foreign security agents and the threats they pose? How does the U.S. rationalize certain countermeasures at the expense of others? I address these questions below and summarize each cluster of FSF policy debates in Table 1.

The first cluster involves the racial identity of FSF in the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic between 1899 and 1934. During this period, the U.S. occupied each of these countries. U.S. policymakers doubted that “racial inferiors” could be relied upon to assist in combating local insurgencies and worried that they would prove incompetent, or worse, disloyal. To manage this “racial inferiority,” the U.S. military put FSF under the control of “racial superiors,” i.e., “white” American officers.

The second cluster occurs between 1912 and 1934. Grounded in the Progressive Era and its push towards the apolitical professionalism, it concerned U.S. anxiety over the politicization of FSF in Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba. Contrary to conventional wisdom, the U.S. did not intend to create military dictatorships in these countries. But U.S. policymakers did

worry that local fighters were themselves disposed to politicization and that U.S.-raised FSF would serve as vehicles to dictatorship. To forestall their inclination for political machinations, the U.S. kept “apolitical” American officers largely in command of local units. The U.S. also attempted to make these units politically neutral by recruiting equal numbers from both political factions.

The third cluster begins in the era of decolonization following World War II, when U.S. policymakers debated how to develop FSF from “underdeveloped,” but newly independent, states. The U.S. worried that its influence would be limited with nationalist forces that had just participated in independence movements. To court these forces, U.S. policymakers siphoned ideas from modernization theory, which explained how Third World officer corps bore an affinity for the U.S. and for “progress.” The U.S. could thus “socialize” these foreign officers into promoting its policy within their respective states. While U.S. officials had once considered “native officers” a dangerous proposition, the introduction of modernization theory legitimized a shift in policy by which the U.S. would now champion these officers. In addition to socialization, the U.S. also deployed agency slack countermeasures that recognized the ostensible sovereignty of newly independent states. They included monitoring FSF with U.S. advisors and trainers, delimiting the kinds of military assistance granted, and bribing foreign governments with “prestige” military equipment.

The fourth cluster revolves around concerns over FSF as illiberal human rights abusers. These concerns arose in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, during military assistance programs to El Salvador in the 1980s, and through protests conducted by School of the Americas Watch (SOAW) in the 1990s and 2000s. FSF were characterized as overly brutal and inclined to apply their newfound skills and arms towards civilian targets. These characterizations hark back to the

first cluster, which emphasized the “uncivilized” ways of “native” warfare. The last cluster, however, has invoked “potential human rights abuser,” instead of “racial inferior,” as the rhetorical basis of the agency problem. To prevent human rights abuses, the U.S. military introduced human rights training into its FSF development programs, particularly at the School of the Americas (SOA).⁸ This measure made use of an extant reliance on “socialization” within FSF discourse to buttress the notion that instruction in human rights would “socialize” FSF into respecting them. During this time, concerned legislators, lobbied by such groups as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and SOAW, passed legislation that would eliminate aid to foreign military units guilty of human rights abuses and investigate abuses committed by U.S.-trained forces.

⁸ As Blakley notes, “WHINSEC [the current name of the SOA]...now has the most highly developed human rights programme of all US military training” (2006: 1445).

Table 1:

Historical period and states involved	Dominant Discourse	Identity of FSF agent	Specification of agency problem	Countermeasures	Resisted/ rejected countermeasures
1899-1934, Philippines, Haiti, Dominican Republic	Scientific racism	Racially inferior	Racially inferior FSF would prove brutal, incompetent, or duplicitous	White American officers	Native officers
1898-1933, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic, Cuba	Progressivism	Partisan	Politicization of FSF will undermine U.S. objectives	Codify nonpartisanship; nonpartisan American officers; balance units	Native Officers
1946-1975, Third World	Modernization theory/ decolonization	Nationalist/ under-developed	Nationalist FSF might resist U.S. authority and align with communism	Monitor FSF; delimit military assistance offered; bribe foreign gov'ts; socialize FSF (encourage politicization)	Direct U.S. command of FSF units
1975-present, Third World	Human rights	Illiberal	FSF will violate U.S.'s stated commitment to human rights, damage U.S. image, and hurt counterinsurgency	Socialize FSF; make military assistance conditional on human rights performance	Direct U.S. command of FSF units

These four clusters of policy debates and the countermeasures they produced mark the terrain of U.S. FSF development over the past century. This terrain reflects the contingent outcomes of uncertain policymaking, where worries about the specific sources of local forces' uncontrollability and unpredictability shaped the U.S.'s methods of training, equipping, and advising them. Rather than compare instances of U.S. FSF development within individual countries, I compare these four clusters of policy debates. For example, the centrality of FSF officers to the third cluster is remarkable because it contrasts so sharply with the previous two clusters. Also, while the first and fourth clusters demonstrate similar tropes about the brutality of foreign fighters, their respective definitions of alterity ("racial inferior" vs. "illiberal") are different and produce different policy responses. Thus, this approach does more than chronicle

the history of U.S. programs to train and equip foreigners. It also applies what Charles Tilly calls “critical comparisons” across the clusters of policy debates to explain why we see only certain FSF development programs implemented during each period (2006).

Applying the conventional principal-agent model to U.S. security outsourcing would leave us with a generic agency problem: the U.S. seeks control over FSF, but by pursuing their own self-interest, these forces threaten U.S. objectives. By exogenously specifying preference divergence, this model can only offer general, superficial insights about the problems of delegating security responsibilities to foreigners. For instance, it would posit that greater goal conflict between principals and agents leads to acute agency problems, that agents situated close to their principal have a harder time shirking, and that well-compensated agents tend to behave. On their own, these claims fail to account for the twists and turns of U.S. FSF development over the past century. By ignoring the shifting social basis of goal incongruity, conventional principal-agent theory fails to explain why we see *this variation* in the calculation and covering of agency costs as opposed to something else.

Constructivist principal-agent theory focuses on the definition of the agency problem from the principal’s (changing) point of view. This allows the researcher to explain, for example, why native FSF officers and their politicization transformed from liabilities before WWII to assets afterwards. To locate and examine that point of view, I focus on the discourse of the principal’s constitutive actors. In the next section, I elaborate a methodology suited to this task.

A Methodology for Analyzing the Constructivist Principal-Agent Model

Constructivist principal-agent theory is itself an ideal-type. Like conventional principal-agent theory, it simplifies reality, but does so in a distinct way by crystallizing the principal’s

discourse and its definition of agent alterity. Like other ideal types, moreover, constructivist principal-agent theory avoids empirical generalization (Kalberg 2002: 1). The point of this approach is not to develop covering laws about principal behavior—i.e., if worry X then response Y across multiple cases—but rather to show how principals in particular socio-historical circumstances draw from their worries about agent misbehavior to design “appropriate” countermeasures and to reject those considered “inappropriate.” Of course, appropriateness is contingent on the social rules within a given temporal and geographic setting. Depending on that setting and the rhetorical resources it contains, the principal will define and act on the social basis of the agency problem differently. In lieu of empirical generalization, therefore, the constructivist principal-agent model promotes methodological generalization (Jackson 2011: 153). While this model may generate case-specific findings, it can be used to explicate any case of agency.

The emphasis on identity and alterity in constructivist principal-agent theory points to discourse analysis as a suitable research method. Such a method enables the researcher to elucidate the principal’s dominant discourse and to connect it to contestation within agency relationships. The specific aim is to link the principal’s rhetoric with the implementation of agency slack countermeasures. This requires the researcher to engage with the “double hermeneutic,” that is, to interpret the interpretations of the actors themselves, and to pay close attention to how those interpretations manifest in the policymaking process over time. As Jackson puts it, this “analyticist” approach “trace[s] and map[s] how particular configurations of ideal-typified factors come together to generate historically specific outcomes in particular cases” (2011: 114).

By conceptualizing discourse as a process linked to “historically specific outcomes,” discourse analysis can tell a causal story. Through discourse analysis, IR scholars have shown, for example, how competing representations within rhetorical battles actualize foreign policies (see Weldes 1999; Jackson 2006; Krebs and Lobasz 2007). Struggles over meaning, legitimacy, and identity generate representations of Self and Other; these representations, in turn, create “conditions of possibility” for only certain policies. Kevin Dunn explains that, “because they enable actors to ‘know’ the object and to act upon what they ‘know,’ representations have very real political implications” (2008: 80). And as Michael Gibbons argues, the “attempt to understand the intersubjective meanings embedded in social life is at the same time an attempt to explain why people act the way they do” (1987: 3). Asking what discourse “makes possible” or investigating its “productive power” is ultimately akin to looking for effects (Yee 1996: 101; Barnett and Duval 2005: 56). Discourse analysis offers the hermeneutic tools necessary to recover meaning within the principal’s rhetoric and the causal pathways necessary to connect that rhetoric with policy.

The logic of “political consequences,” “making possible,” and “productivity of discourse” becomes more explicit in Weber’s conception of adequate causality (see Jackson 2011: 148-152). As Buss explains, adequate causation means that, “a circumstance may be considered to have caused an effect if it can be shown that the same effect would probably not have occurred without it” (1999: 321). In the case of U.S. efforts to internationalize its military manpower, agency slack countermeasures become an “adequate effect” of the rhetorical resources deployed within FSF policy debates. This highlights the alternative countermeasures that policymakers rejected, resisted, or simply ignored. For example, the U.S. did consider placing FSF in the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic under “native officers.” But

policymakers rejected or resisted that alternative on racial grounds, claiming that “native officers” would exploit their authority and brutalize the local population. From there, the researcher can show how adopting one of these alternatives would have yielded different consequences from what actually occurred. Had the U.S. allowed “native officers,” for instance, its commitment to FSF would have been far less direct and costly. To take another example, had modernization theory not informed U.S. policymakers post WWII, the newfound emphasis on foreign officers would probably not have become so pronounced. And finally, had SOAW and groups like it not mobilized to protest the human rights abuses committed by U.S.-trained FSF, the U.S. would probably not have recognized “illiberal” FSF as such a problem, and would have probably not made the SOA/WHINSEC the showpiece of human rights instruction that it is today. Ultimately, these counterfactuals allow the researcher to trace the trajectory of contestation within agency relationships.

Sources and the Mechanics of Using Them

To conduct this discourse analysis, I used the historical literature to isolate and collect primary sources relevant to the challenges of U.S. security outsourcing. Texts spanning the hundred-year history of U.S. FSF development (whose very existence, it should be noted, challenges facile representation of foreign troops as robotic policy instruments) constitute the main empirical data for analysis. For each of the four clusters of policy debate, I attempted to identify a “canonical text” (Neumann 2009) to which other texts frequently referred, or, failing that, texts centrally located within the debate. I collected a text if it authoritatively described foreign fighters, the policies of arming and training them, the risks involved in such policies, and the measures proposed to mitigate those risks. Relevant texts came from the U.S. State

Department, National Security Council, War Department/Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and Congress, in addition to non-governmental sources like the National Security Archive, RAND, SOAW, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International. This multitudinous catalogue includes meeting minutes, policy papers, official reports, manuals and congressional testimony.

To trace the first cluster of debates, which concerned FSF development in the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, I benefited from the historical literature on U.S. interventions in each country. Bibliographies from Calder (2006), Linn (1989), Renda (2001), Schmidt (1995), and others directed me to relevant primary sources. Several of these sources were readily available from online databases, including testimony from military leaders before congressional committees; War Department reports on conducting military occupations (which have now been digitized in their entirety by Google Books); cables from the State Department's *Foreign Relations of the United States* archive; archived *New York Times* news reports; and articles from academic and military journals of the era. Other records required off-site research trips, including those from the National Archives in College Park, Maryland and the U.S. Army Heritage and Education Center in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. At the National Archives, I took 525 digital photos of records relating to War Plan Brown, the U.S.'s secret contingency scenario to quell an uprising in the Philippines led by the very scout and constabulary units that the U.S. had created. At the U.S. Army Heritage and Education Center, I took 302 photographs of documents from the personal papers of Lieutenant Matthew Batson and from several of his contemporaries. Batson originated U.S. FSF development in the Philippines and was thus very much involved in debates over its merits. All these resources clustered around contestation within the U.S. government over how, if at all, to develop foreign security proxies.

Organizing and coding these texts involved an ongoing dialogue between data and theory. From the repeated expressions of U.S. uncertainty over delegating security responsibilities to foreigners, I made the inductive leap to a broad, principal-agent configuration; with this configuration in mind as I read over these texts, I narrowed my focus to specific, theoretically significant, phrases and themes. Mediating between induction and deduction, I developed an evolving coding scheme within an agency theory framework. This enabled my discourse analysis to serve my theoretical objectives.

As I read over my textual data, I added thematic content related to the problem of agency and to the means of mitigating it. This content provided the “tags” with which I could code the documents:

Discursive Cluster 1:

Definition of Agency Problem	Formulation of Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Racial inferiority • Barbarous natives • Treating native troops' loyalty as variable • Doubting native troops' loyalty altogether 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control of FSF • Organizing Constabulary/Scouts • Exploiting existing ethnic divides • Segregating loyal native troops from disloyal ones • White officer leadership • Affirming reliability/loyalty • Disarming native troops
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question of native officers 	

I used an Excel spreadsheet to tag and organize the sources already available online.⁹

And I used Apple's iPhoto software to tag and organize digital photographs from the off-site

⁹ This spreadsheet can be accessed via Google docs at: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/pub?hl=en_US&hl=en_US&key=0AmXZRRaew620dGZMQUxwS0ZJbmFhb3IzNzlWaTRieWc&output=html.

Some of the tagged pages are bolded. This serves the same function of the “check mark” as a tag on the digital photographs and specifies a particularly strong indication of the agency theme.

government archives.¹⁰ Using this software enabled me to retrieve and annotate key documents, group similar documents, and apply various keyword combinations to the entire photo library.

The second cluster (chapter 4) required many of the same sources used to document the first. I drew upon War Department reports, Congressional Record testimony, and State Department cables. These texts revealed concerns over the partisanship of foreign security proxies in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua and the remedies proposed to maintain their neutrality. Over the course of collecting these texts, I developed this modified list of tags with which to code them:

Cluster 2:

Definition of Agency Problem	Formulation of Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treating FSF loyalty as variable • Doubting FSF loyalty altogether • Apolitical? • Question of native officers • Partisan culture/history 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Codification of nonpartisanship • Apolitical (American) officer leadership • Balancing of political loyalties

I captured much of the third cluster (chapter 5) in its canonical text: the records from President Eisenhower's 1959 Committee to Study the United States Military Assistance Program. Known as the Draper Committee, it debated how to effect FSF development in an era of decolonization and "developing" states. While the committee published a final report for public consumption, the committee's secret files—9,800 documents in all, housed at the

¹⁰ While the materials I have collected from the archives are available to the public, they are stored far from the public's view. I am therefore committed to making them easily accessible. I want readers to be able to scrutinize the inferences I make from my textual sources by seeing those sources for themselves, without having to physically visit the archives. I have therefore created a companion website displaying digital photographs of the archival documents cited in my research. This website can be accessed at: http://www.flickr.com/photos/rittinger_archive-research/collectionshttp://www.flickr.com/photos/rittinger_archive-research/sets. I cite these documents using their alphanumeric digital codes.

Eisenhower Presidential Library—contain the conflicting views and uncertainties that the final report marginalizes. In addition, I supplemented these Draper Committee files with social scientific texts on “Third World” modernization and the military’s place within it: “Armies in the Process of Political Modernization” by Lucien Pye, “Optimizing Military Assistance Training” by Charles Windle and T.R. Vallance, *Military Institutions and Coercion in the Developing Nations*, by Morris Janowitz, *The Military and Modernization*, by Henry Bienen, and *Political Order and Changing Societies* by Samuel Huntington.

Cluster 3:

Definition of Agency Problem	Formulation of Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transnational Constitution of Force • Control of FSF • Criticisms of MAP (military assistance program) • Internal security • Localization of global defense policy • Enhancing sovereignty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delimiting military equipment/training to foreign forces • Surveillance of foreign forces • Socialization of foreign forces • Buying off foreign forces/governments

Finally, to investigate the fourth cluster (chapter 6), I collected records from the Reagan Presidential Library and the National Security Archive at George Washington University. These records related to U.S. military assistance for El Salvador during its civil war. The National Security Archive also provided resources on the controversial U.S. assistance to the Colombian military for counternarcotics operations. I was drawn to these archives because much of the energy for the protests against FSF since the 1990s—particularly against the SOA—has come from outrage over human rights abuses committed by Salvadorian and Colombian troops. Another key text of human rights anxiety in El Salvador came from a Benjamin Schwarz’s first-hand account of U.S. efforts to reform the Salvadorian military, published by the RAND

Corporation in 1991. For a more recent perspective, I conducted fieldwork with SOAW protesters. Their rallies, workshops, and congressional lobbying have all contributed to the human rights debate within FSF policy. And, as discussed above, I integrate the current academic debate into this cluster because of its emphasis on “socialization” as an agency slack countermeasure. Finally, I compiled testimony and reports surrounding legislation meant to reduce human rights abuses by recipients of U.S. military aid. This legislation includes the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which Congress updated in 1973 by adding human rights provisions to military assistance; the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, which mandated a human rights component to military training for foreign soldiers; the 1997 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, which required foreign military units to be free of anyone implicated in human rights abuse as a precondition for receiving aid; and the Latin America Military Training Review Act of 2009 (HR 2567), a bill sponsored by Representative Jim McGovern (D-MA)—and coordinated with SOAW—that would open a formal investigation into the human rights abuses of SOA graduates.

Cluster 4:

Definition of Agency Problem	Formulation of Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human rights abuse • Brutality • Violent culture/history • Connections to non-state armed forces (paramilitary “death squads”) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialization of foreign forces • Making military assistance conditional (certification, buying off, monitoring, screening)

Conclusion

In this chapter I have recast agency relationship as a social rather than as an economic problem. To explicate this problem, I have developed a constructivist principal-agent theory and a corresponding methodology. In contrast to conventional principal-agent theory, this constructivist model treats preference formation as an endogenous process among the principal's constitutive actors vis-à-vis their agents. The principal animates this process by attributing to its agents identities marked by alterity. This alterity, in turn, indicates for the principal specific sources of misbehavior, uncontrollability and unpredictability. In response, the principal customizes agency slack countermeasures so that they address those sources. To show this model in action, I have applied it to the U.S.'s outsourcing of security responsibilities to foreign armed forces over the past century. This model helps to explain the controversy provoked by security outsourcing, the kinds of threats that these forces posed to U.S. interests, and the particular countermeasures (from among all those available) deployed to address those threats.

Constructivist principal-agent theory is not limited to the case I have described and has application across various principal-agent relationships. For example, one could use it to build on the work of Ronald Krebs (2005) and compare U.S. FSF development with the historical experience of domestic minorities—including African Americans, homosexuals and women—or private security contractors in U.S. military policy. Or, one could examine the experiences of Africans and Indians in French and British imperial forces. Constructivist principal-agent theory would highlight salient comparisons among principals (the U.S., France, and Britain) and agents (foreign forces, domestic minorities in the U.S., and private security contractors). It would further reveal how different principal-agent identities and configurations structure the incorporation of “questionable” groups into security forces. Of course, one could just as easily

apply this theory to non-security principal-agent relationships. Agents, be they executives, congressional representatives, NGO staffers, delegates to international organizations, etc., all pose certain kinds of problems for their principals. But what exactly about those specific agents strikes the principal as worrisome? By focusing on the principal's perception of its agent, this theory discloses the instantiation of specific agency problems while accounting for the choice of agency slack countermeasures from the menu of policy options. Such an approach could enrich our understanding of any principal-agent relationship.

In the next chapter, I put constructivist principal-agent theory to work. I examine how, in the early 20th century, U.S. policymakers defined the FSF agency problem around race and the racial inferiority of their security proxies in the Philippines, Haiti, and Dominican Republic.

Chapter 3:

“He Ain’t No Brother of Mine’: U.S. Resistance and Responses to FSF Development in the Philippines, Dominican Republic, and Haiti, 1899-1934

Introduction

Between 1899 and 1934, the United States internationalized its military manpower in the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. During this period, the U.S. occupied each country and integrated Filipinos, Haitians, and Dominicans into its security apparatus. Amid insurgencies, banditry, and social unrest, these local constabularies and army auxiliaries held the promise of facilitating American efforts to restore order. Their knowledge of the geography and people made them especially well suited to conducting counterinsurgencies and performing basic police work. So why did this seemingly beneficial policy of outsourcing security responsibilities elicit “prolonged and acrimonious debate” within the War Department and Congress and among American military personnel in the field (Hurley 1938: 34)? Why was the U.S. tentative in its approach to raising, training, and arming these local forces?

Based on extensive archival research into U.S. government records, I find that the controversy stemmed from characterizations of Filipinos, Haitians, and Dominicans as “racial inferiors.” During this time of scientific racism, race provided a broadly inclusive category for understanding difference and for explaining the behavior of “inferior” peoples (Barkan 1992; Furedi 1998; Jacobson 2000). As Furedi explains, “[a]ll shades of intellectual opinion in early twentieth-century America were influenced by some variant of racial thought” (1998: 9). That included the opinion of “Anglo-American political elites,” whose “view that some races were superior assumed the status of a self-evident truth” (1998: 5). Among U.S. government officials,

“racial inferiority” meant incompetence, uncontrollability, and barbarity. Putting weapons into the hands of such “inferiors” represented a “dubious experiment” that would jeopardize U.S. military campaigns (Hurley 1938: 64). It also came to represent a failed policy, as many critics would later contend in their evaluations of native constabularies. Characterizations of racial inferiority thus operated in two ways. First, they fueled doubts among U.S. war planners over the prospect of outsourcing security responsibilities to local armed forces. Second, they provided a readymade explanation for any failing that these forces showed.

By energizing the policy debate, fears of racial difference affected how the U.S. went about raising, training, and monitoring “racial inferiors.” The U.S. mined its understanding of their racial identity for ways to render them reliable instruments of its foreign policy. Specifically, the U.S. hedged its approach by requiring that they serve under “White American Officers.” American officers, rather than “native” officers, offered policymakers a safeguard against the liabilities of raising and deploying non-White fighters. Security outsourcing within these U.S. occupations thus remained far from total. While the U.S. experimented with training some “native” officers during the 1920s and early 1930s, doubts about the reliability of a local officer corps stunted that training program. Ultimately, the U.S. resisted ceding officer responsibilities to those whom it considered racially unqualified.

This chapter allows me to show how the heterogeneity of interests assumed within the principal-agent problem masks the heterogeneity of identities defined through the principal’s discourse. My reworking of agency theory unmask the invocation of racial alterity in debates over arming and training foreign fighters. Between 1899 and 1934, U.S. officials calibrated their categorizations of Filipinos, Haitians, and Dominicans through degrees of racial Otherness. They characterized local forces as agents whose “agency” was qualified by biological deficiencies.

The theoretical problem of agency thus assumes a new significance when applied to these concrete historical settings. The U.S. worried about the effectiveness of its foreign agents because of racially determined qualities, such as uncontrollability, duplicity, and barbarity. For the U.S., in other words, the interests of in-country forces reflected the vagaries of racial backwardness. Their “guile,” a generic term attributed to all agents, had a particular source: racial inferiority. As a result, legitimizing FSF development emphasized the “White American Officer” and his controlling, uplifting, paternal influence over backward races. Racial hierarchy thus established both the basis for fears about agency slack and the preferred strategy of tightening it.

Constructivist principal-agent theory thus generates two central insights. First, it makes sense of the U.S.’s uncertainty about training and relying on security forces from the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. Second, it explains the particular method by which the U.S. implemented programs for developing these forces. In the sections that follow, I first demonstrate how American rhetoric articulated agency costs in racial terms by presenting racial inferiority as the hurdle that FSF development would need to overcome. And second, I show how policymakers sought to cover those costs by placing American officers in command of FSF units.

FSF Anxiety: “The subject of native troops at once prompts the inquiry, are they reliable?” – Lt. Matthew Batson, 4th Calvary U.S. Army (F0731)

U.S. foreign relations discourse between 1899 and 1934 constructed FSF development in the Philippines and Caribbean as potentially threatening to U.S. interests. In this section, I illustrate how a racial discourse provided a framework in which to resist the FSF project and to account for whatever failures it suffered.

The first major U.S. effort to develop FSF occurred in 1899 in the Philippines following the Spanish American War. Finding itself in possession of these islands, the U.S. confronted the problem of maintaining order while conducting a counterinsurgency against erstwhile nationalist allies (Linn 1989). The nearing expiration of enlistments for U.S. Army volunteers forced U.S. officials to identify alternative sources of armed manpower. As the *New York Times* remarked at the time, the “question of how far it may be possible to enlist Filipinos for police and military service in the islands is an intensely interesting and important one” (Dec. 1 1900). The War Department and its representatives in Manila considered recruiting, training, and arming security forces composed of local Filipinos. Far from being self-evidently beneficial, such a policy evoked “prolonged and acrimonious debate” and concerns about “experimental outfits of doubtful loyalty” (Hurley 1938: 64; Blount 1913: 403-404).

For guidance, the United States War Department drew from the European experience with “colonial armies” in Africa and Asia. The British model proved especially popular. A report from the Taft Philippine Commission (the acting legislature within the Philippines) noted that the “experience of England... furnishes a precedent for our guidance which should not be overlooked” (Senate 1901: 81). The U.S. wanted their own native wards to make “as good and loyal soldiers as are now the native troops of the British” (Ward 1902: 803). By learning from the British approach to colonial administration, U.S. officials sought to turn FSF into “the nucleus of a future army like that of India (*NYT* April 21 1901: 3). Spain’s use of the Guardia Civil in the Philippines before the U.S.’s arrival furnished an even more germane exemplar (Lobingier 1910: 311; Seaman 1900: 854). Those formulating the U.S.’s approach to foreign occupation felt that natives once loyal to the Spanish could be recruited again by an external power to combat nationalist insurgents. Ostensibly, this “colonial” force could fight alongside,

and eventually relieve, American troops. Fully cognizant of these European precedents, U.S. officials saw the beneficial possibilities of developing and stationing FSF in areas for which the U.S. claimed responsibility.

In practice, however, many saw these possibilities with far less optimism. As Richard Meixsel explains, many in the U.S. army “reject[ed]...the European model of colonial conquest” that exploited local manpower to enforce security. “Despite the obvious utility of Filipino soldiers,” writes Meixsel, “their recruitment had always sat uneasily with many American officers” (2002: 335). Hurley amplifies this unease, noting that, “there was great protest in American military circles against this arming of natives” (1938: 34-35). Henry Allen, the Chief of the Philippine Constabulary, acknowledged the “apprehension frequently expressed by certain critics...concerning the loyalty of the Filipinos and the danger of employing them as armed forces.” While a proponent of these forces, he still felt anxious over the “number of guns put into the hands of natives” and insisted on a counterbalancing force of American troops (U.S. War Department 1903: 135, 49). Similarly, Lieutenant Matthew Batson, a trainer of Filipino scouts, wrote in his diary that American officers, particularly Major General Elwell Otis, felt Filipinos “could not be depended upon to remain loyal to the Americans.” The “general feeling” among those officers, he wrote, “was that every Filipino was really an insurgent” (F0774). This feeling led some military officials to reject idea of an American colonial army altogether. As Captain J.N. Munro remarked, the Filipinos who initially volunteered to fight alongside the Americans “were rejected, the experiment not being considered safe at that time” (1905: 180).

While demands for manpower eventually led to the creation of several “experimental” Filipino scout units, controversy over the FSF question persisted (Meixsel 2002: 340). By 1904, after five years of “experimenting” with local forces, the War Department conceded that the

“actual value of the Filipino as a regular soldier is still an open question...his loyalty to those who employ him, and many other questions of vital importance have not been decided” (U.S. War Department 1904: 207). The idea of integrating foreigners into U.S. military operations thus remained worrisome. Would these natives prove as militarily capable as their American counterparts? Would they turn against those who recruited and trained them? Doubts about local security forces lingered even as the policy of developing them moved tentatively forward.

Several civilian authorities also rejected integrating indigenous manpower into the U.S.’s “insular administration.” Senator Henry M. Teller of Colorado argued, for example, that “if we are going to hold the Philippines by force, by an army, it will be a great deal better to hold them by our own Army than by one raised there” (*Congressional Record* 1901: 1080). Also, civilian officials living in the Philippines revealed that, “none here has confidence in the constabulary,” and called it “worse than useless” (Senate 1902: 2484). A prominent American businessman working in the Philippines showed similar doubts and implored the Philippine Commission to “get the people disarmed. All arms must be taken away. The natives can not be trusted with arms among themselves” (Philippine Commission 1900: 11). Finally, in his commentary on the “Philippine Problem,” the academic Henry Parker Willis characterized the “organization of a native force under central control” as a “discredited expedient,” both “inefficient and cruel” (1905: 121-122, 143). Not just military officials doubted that a foreign force, of “questionable” capabilities and loyalties, could replace, let alone complement, the American military in the Philippines. Many civilian leaders also considered such a force ineffective at best and, at worst, a liability for U.S. counterinsurgency operations.

During the U.S intervention in Haiti, similar concerns were directed at the gendarmerie, a native constabulary recruited, armed, and trained by American Marines. In a statement to the

Navy Department, the State Department outlined the U.S.'s tentative approach towards local Haitian security forces: “*Until such time* as the gendarmerie has proved itself loyal and efficient in all emergencies and internal peace of Haiti is thereby definitely assured, it is the desire of this department that [martial law] be continued” (Senate 1922: 1694, emphasis added). Four years later, in Senate testimony before the Select Committee on Haiti and Santo Domingo, Colonel Williams expressed continuing skepticism of the gendarmerie project. “Our greatest problem in the organization of the gendarmerie,” he explained, “was the gendarme. Our little experience with him had led us to believe that he was utterly indifferent to the value of human life; that he was prone to make the most of his police authority, and very liable to exceed it.” The problem, Williams went on to say, was that the “Haitian’s way of looking at things” would “not bring about a condition of police efficiency such as we sought.” Brigadier General Eli Cole, also of the Marine Corps, described to the Senate committee the delicate process of raising Haitian troops and the potential for disaster. “There should,” he said, “be plenty of white troops in Haiti to back up the white officers, protect them, and to steady the gendarmes.” Otherwise, “one detachment [of gendarmes] might go wild and kill its officers, and the disorganization might spread like wildfire.” Cole hastened to add that, “I don’t believe it would be happen, but the danger is there, and provision should be made beforehand to meet it.” And in his Senate testimony, General Caitlin contrasted the reliability of Americans leading the gendarmerie with the Haitian gendarmes themselves. The Americans, he declared, “were people that we could rely on; we could not rely on a Haitian. That was absolutely out of the question” (Senate 1922: 553, 601, 1780, 687).

Descriptions of the difficulties involved in raising a native constabulary in the Dominican Republic came from Lieutenant Edward Fellowes. As one of the Marine trainers assigned to the

Guardia Nacional Dominicana, he lamented the “handicap under which an instructor works with these natives.” Frustrated at having to train the “most ignorant and crude specimens possible,” Fellowes observed that the “general lack of a sense of responsibility and initiative, and what might be called a ‘moral sense’ is what prevents the [Dominican] Republic from possessing one of the finest bodies of troops in the world. Plagued by high levels of illiteracy, a “natural aversion for soap and razor,” and a propensity to “loaf away time,” the Guardia could make only limited progress towards enforcing order in the Dominican Republic (1923: 229-230, 232).

Doubts about raising FSF were grounded in conceptions of “native barbarity” and the hazards of unleashing it. Many felt that natives lacked the civilization necessary to temper their behavior in war and that arming them would unleash savagery upon their American handlers or the local civilians. In evaluating the ethnic minority Macabebes of the Philippines as a prospective complement to U.S. military forces, the *New York Times* noted that “they are hard to restrain from outrage, looting and indiscriminate killing. Several American officers have declined service with the Macabebes on the ground that it was impossible to restrain them in moments of excitement” (July 17, 1900: 10). Such moments involved, for example, administering the “water cure” to extract information from insurgents (Senate 1902: 951). General Hughes echoed such worries about Filipinos’ respect for the economy of violence. He noted that they would “do too much shooting; that is, would kill more than was necessary” (Senate 1902: 572). And, while praising the willingness to “experiment with Filipino troops,” the War Department’s 1900 report on the Philippines still recognized that the “main trouble has been to restrain them to the usages of civilized warfare” (1904b: 135). Similarly, Lieutenant Ward explained that Filipinos can “be as savage and cruel as any wild beast of the Indian jungle, and if left alone would probably relapse, and again become savages (1902: 794, 796). Senator Richard

F. Pettigrew of South Dakota intensified these accusations, asking, “what justification is there for placing weapons in the hands of these barbarous people, whom the Secretary of War in his testimony says murder and burn and rob, and whom our soldiers say torture their victims?” Finally, Senator Teller, denouncing the Macabebes’ “absolute wickedness and cruelty,” pleaded for the U.S. to conduct a “civilized war” and “dismiss the Macabebes” from U.S. service altogether (*Congressional Record* 1901: 1715, 1080).

In describing his recruits as “fierce fighters, inclined to be merciless,” Fellowes made similar appraisals of the Guardia Nacional Dominicana’s dangerous character (1927: 232). Worries about native barbarity on the other side of Hispaniola were even more acute. General Cole warned, for example, that despite “the veneer and polish a Haitian may have, he is absolutely savage under the skin and under strain reverts to type.” General Smedley Butler, a leading proponent of the Haitian gendarmerie, still admitted that, left on its own, the gendarmerie would become “brutal with the people, unnecessarily harsh.” Professor Kelsey, a commentator on the American occupation of Haiti, reiterated Butler’s concerns, describing the “many instances of overbearing misconduct on the part of the native gendarmes.” And, in explaining to the Senate inquiry why members of the Haitian population had defected to the “cacos,” or, bandits, General Catlin identified “fear of the gendarmes” as the cause. He explained that the “native gendarme was very prone to use his position against other natives...a number of cases were reported where natives were abused and robbed, and women carried off, and shot, and things like that” (Senate 1922: 1780, 517, 1243, 650). This brutality, the general argued, hurt U.S. policy. It turned ordinary Haitians towards the bandits for security and away from the U.S.-trained native security forces. Delegating responsibilities to these “savage” forces thus threatened insular administrators with an especially pernicious kind of agency slack, one in which the

principal became implicated in behaviors it (officially) considered morally reprehensible, if not deleterious to its objectives.

Fears over uncontrollable barbarity were informed by racial hierarchy, which treated indigenous populations as biologically backward. In an era of “scientific” racism, medical expertise legitimized this hierarchy. It presented with a dispassionate air the problems and possibilities of enlisting native “material.” Because such material came in different tribes of different “stock,” U.S. officials tried to identify the physical characteristics distinguishing, for example, “the intelligent type of Filipino” (Senate 1902: 2429). In that spirit, Ward made elaborating racial qualities a necessary precondition for considering which Filipinos to recruit: “When we want a man for a certain particular work, we first ask what kind of a man he is.” To address that question, Ward provided a meticulous description of the Filipinos’ “Malay race.” It covered their “olive yellow complexion, inclining to light brown or cinnamon, somewhat flat features, high check bones, black and very slightly oblique eyes, small, but not flat noses, with wide and dilated nostrils,” etc., etc. (1902: 793-794).

While Ward found these “martial race” characteristics potentially advantageous on the battlefield, others doubted that such a people would prove dependable. Allen, whose “moderate racial views put him in the minority among the senior officers of his day,” described these doubters in the U.S. Army as “nigger haters” who rejected the Philippine Constabulary altogether (Twichell 1974: 128-29). A report from the *Army and Navy Journal* denouncing the constabulary as a “failure” placed the blame “in no degree whatever to the officers in charge of it, but partly to the material they have had to work with and partly to the disconcerting influences surrounding their labors” (June 10, 1905: 1115). These influences, to which the *Army and Navy Journal* obliquely referred, included “educated men among the Filipinos.” Such men, Taft

explained to the Committee on the Philippines, could manipulate most of the population, given its “absolutely ignorant and credulous” disposition (Senate 1902: 291). And finally, Willis clarified just how “entirely foreign” the Filipinos were “to the inhabitants of the United States in all of their ways of thought, action, and prejudice.” He explained how attempting “to force upon them methods and institutions with which they were wholly unacquainted and for which they had no natural aptitude” would prove as futile as trying “to turn a palm tree into an elm” (1905: 444).

In considering the brutality shown by the Haitian gendarmerie, U.S. officials drew upon similar notions of racial inferiority. This “unnecessary friction” came about, wrote Douglas, from the “race prejudices of the officers of the marines...drawn as they are largely from the South” (1927: 394). When, for example, the chairman of the Senate inquiry generalized the problems plaguing U.S. efforts to raise native constabularies as “a difficulty which confronts every organizer of constabulary in the Tropics the world around,” Colonel Williams extended this point in racial terms: “it is characteristic of the lower races to exceed authority, if they are invested with it. We had the same trouble in the Philippines.” General Cole provided a more detailed description of the various racial “types” in Haiti, and linked racial characteristics with levels of trustworthiness. Many of the “mixed type,” he reported, “are highly educated and polished, but their sincerity must always be doubted.” And while these “European Haitians” may have a “European education, and long years of residence in Europe,” they will “revert in a few minutes to the mental state of a savage in the heart of Africa” (Senate 1922: 557, 1780).

Marine officers in the Dominican Republic conceived of their Dominican trainees through similarly stark “racial stereotypes” (Millet 2010: 81). Fellowes, for example, offered his authoritative position on the racial character of Dominican recruits. “As a general rule,” he explained, “the degree of intelligence increased with the decrease of the ebony tinge. The blacker

recruits were generally simple-minded giants who did what they were told simply from the habits of discipline.” Indeed, the increasing numbers of “clearer complexion” volunteers for the Guardia raised Fellowes’s hopes of turning it from the “scum of the Island” into a viable constabulary (1927: 231).

In the “black republic” of Haiti, racial denigration was common. In his biography of Butler, Hans Schmidt describes how the commanding Marine general in Haiti, General Waller, saw Haitians as if they were troublesome slaves on his family’s southern plantation. According to Schmidt, Waller felt “instinctively wary of Smedley’s black troopers, and once remarked, ‘you can never trust a nigger with a gun’ ” (1987: 84).

Racial denigration of Filipinos was also widespread. As one provincial governor explained to the Committee on the Philippines, “almost without exception soldiers, and also many officers, refer to the natives in their presence as ‘niggers’ ” (Senate 1902: 884). American soldiers saw their contact with this alien population through the prism of racial distinctions. A popular Army song from the era reveals how American personnel inscribed boundaries between themselves and those whom Taft had characterized as his “little brown brothers”:

I'm only a common soldier man in the blasted Philippines,
They say I've got brown brothers here but I don't know what it means,
I like the word fraternity, but still I draw the line--
He may be a brother to William Howard Taft, but he ain't
no brother of mine (quoted in Hurley 1938: 35).

American racism thus pervaded attempts at developing FSF in the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. It supplied U.S. officials with “rhetorical commonplaces” to doubt local security forces and to explain their bad behavior (Jackson 2006: ix). Without well-defined, seemingly scientific views about a racially based biological hierarchy, it would have been difficult for U.S. officials to articulate with such specificity their apprehensions about and

evaluations of the FSF project. Characterized as a racial Other/Inferior, FSF agents threatened their U.S. principal with the broad range of slacking behaviors associated with “lower races,” ranging from incompetence to barbarity to disloyalty.

Principal-agent theory fails—albeit intentionally—to identify the specificity of such a threat a priori. While agency posits *that* a threat of slack exists, its sparse, rational-choice abstractions have little to say about what constitutes, or, *constructs* the specificity of that threat. In this way, the limitations of agency theory provoke questions and illuminate avenues for empirical analysis. These limitations render substantively and theoretically significant historical moments in which problems of agency became instantiated in practice. As my analysis shows, during the early 20th century, the question of raising native security forces compelled U.S. officials to answer through rhetoric on “inferior races” and the propensity of such races to make trouble for their “superiors.” A deep reservoir of racial bigotry supplied U.S. officials with a mode of articulating their worries about an uncertain U.S.-FSF relationship. By invoking race as a classification system in policy debates, officials actualized a *specific manifestation* of the agency problem with an attendant set of agency costs. Ultimately, the dangers that local forces posed to U.S. counterinsurgency operations assumed a distinctly racial basis. And, U.S. handlers could interpret incompetence or brutality as the result of ingrained, racial qualities. The language of race thus defined the agency problem that the U.S. faced in the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

In the next section, I unearth a once classified War Department contingency plan and examine it as a notable manifestation of FSF anxiety.

War Plan Brown: “There was no reason for believing that the mere recital of a Constabulary oath would make natives loyal American policemen” (Hurley 1938: 64)

Developed in secret by the War Department's Joint Planning Committee as one contingency within a series of hypothetical, color-coded scenarios, War Plan Brown envisioned a nationalist Filipino uprising supported by the very Scout and Constabulary units that the U.S. had once developed. The War Department worried that the Scouts and Constabulary would align themselves with the "continuing movement on the part of Filipino politicians...to gain independence for the Philippine Islands" (F0540). While other U.S. expressions of FSF anxiety focused on incompetence, brutality, and, at worst, isolated disloyalty, Plan Brown countenanced concerted, full-scale betrayal by local forces. This represented the worst possible outcome of the U.S.-FSF problematique.

And yet, Plan Brown's noteworthiness is not so much its expression of FSF doubt—extreme as it was—but rather its timing. By the early 1920s, when the War Department first created the plan, and especially by the early 1930s, when it finalized the plan, the Scouts and Constabulary had had plenty of time to reassure their doubting American handlers. Despite an isolated mutiny in 1924 over pay, these units had long served as the "bulwark of American rule in the Philippines" (Meixsel 2002: 333). To maintain the illusion that their excellent performance had indeed won over the U.S., the plan made a point of keeping itself secret. The War Department warned of "embarrassment and evil consequences... if even a suspicion of the preparation of such a Plan became public." And so, "no mention of it will be made to any native whatsoever" (F0475). U.S. officials did not want to "create the impression that the loyalty to the United States of the Filipino people, their officials, the Constabulary, the Police of [sic] the Philippine Scouts is in any way doubted or even considered" (F0262). Keeping Plan Brown covert became so important because its mere existence revealed that the U.S. was willing to overlook the Filipinos' record of faithful service. By formulating extensive plans for countering a

revolt, the U.S. betrayed its continuing doubts about FSF development in the Philippines, even though such development had represented the U.S.'s "most successful experience...in organizing foreign constabulary forces" (Millet 2010: 7). Despite evidence of competence, the Scouts and Constabulary still provoked worry among U.S. war planners. For the War Department in the 1920s and 30s, the "dubious experiment" in the Philippines was far from over.

In justifying its existence, Plan Brown explicated why raising FSF posed risks to the country raising them. A "major emergency [i.e., an uprising in the Philippines] discloses the obvious fact that the decision...to give natives military training, organize them for war and depend upon them for military support, is a great liability in case of internal disturbance." As the War Department explained, because of the U.S. occupation, "a very considerable number of men have had efficient training in the scouts and constabulary" (F0410; F0550). U.S. war-planners worried about the implications of having raised an efficient, lethal force of questionable loyalty. Plan Brown noted, for example, "that the pressure certain to be brought on the Scouts to join the insurrection is very real and should not be overlooked" (F0460). To counter such pressures, the plan called for U.S. personnel "to impress on native troops the fact that they are under oath to support the United States, the necessity for them to remain loyal, and...the seriousness of any disloyal act and the harm they will do their country, themselves and their dependents by failing to remain loyal to the United States" (F0178). In the plan, the War Department saw it as imperative to "make a continuing study of measures to increase American prestige and strengthen the loyalty of the native soldier" (F0485).

Positing that the U.S. had not yet secured such loyalty, Plan Brown planned for a "rebellion against the sovereignty of the United States" in which "all native troops except those at Camp John Hay and Pettit Barracks are either disloyal or cannot be trusted" (F0125). Even in

less dire versions of this scenario, the plan still evaluated the “loyalty of native troops” as a “variable,” never as a given (F0264). Various sections of the plan thus concentrated on the strength, armaments, and size of native forces that the U.S. would potentially confront in combat (F0265; F0476). To mitigate this conflict, the plan called on the U.S. to “segregate the loyal and disloyal elements of the native troops,” to effect the “disarmament of all native troops,” and to “safeguard use of seacoast and mobile armament that might be secured by native troops” (F0178; F0165; F0181). Other measures included “espionage among civilians and native troops to detect evidence of disloyalty, or conduct prejudicial to interests of the United States;” the “disposal of disloyal troops;” and reinforcing the American garrison with additional recruits or with reassigned U.S. army units (F0194; F0416).

Plan Brown invoked the same racial distinctions articulated in other FSF policy debates. One section of the plan outlined “Native Characteristics” and described how the “reasoning processes of the natives of all classes differ greatly from the American or European.” One must be wary of these natives, it explained, because “they feign friendship but have little loyalty” (F0481). Hence, in the event of a native rebellion, Plan Brown looked to those whom the War Department trusted with weapons, i.e., white people. It called for the U.S. “to assemble white troops,” to enlist “White Civilians” and “to reduce the proportion of native to white troops” (F0492; F0493). In a subsection titled, “Utilization of the white personnel of the Theater of Operations,” the plan mandated that the commanding general “increase the strength of white units of his command to peace strength by active recruiting. He is authorized also to call into active service for an indefinite period such white reserve officers residing within his Department” (F0361, underlining in original). Moreover, one of Plan Brown’s authors expressed considerable anxiety over the U.S.’s recent policy of bringing native officers into the Philippines

Scouts, particularly the 24th Field Artillery. “This regiment,” he warned, “should be carefully watched and at the slightest indication of disloyalty on the part of this regiment’s personnel its guns should be immediately taken away.” The author distinguished U.S. colonial policy from what seemed to him the more prudent approach taken by the British, French and Spanish. These colonial powers, unlike the U.S., recognized the dangers of equipping natives with particularly powerful weapons like artillery, and thus only manned artillery units with “white officers and white enlisted men” (F0575).

It should be remembered that War Plan Brown reflected what war-planners tend to agonize over: the worst-case scenario.¹¹ The extent to which U.S. policymakers actually anticipated such a rebellion remains unclear. But the reality of the threat is less important than how those in the War Department planned for it. Questions about FSF loyalty occupied a central place in their considerations of internal disorder in the Philippines. Plan Brown could not guarantee that Filipino security forces raised by the U.S. would remain loyal. Instead, this plan admitted that these forces, compelled by nationalist agitation and the “race question,” could turn against the American occupation (F0279). The envisioning of such a scenario required extant concerns about delegating security responsibilities to non-white forces. And so, while the plan’s predictions were most likely exaggerated, the racial anxiety over FSF development that it drew upon was undoubtedly real. In the next section, racial hierarchy again comes into play, but in this instance, as the basis for remedying agency slack.

The Pro-FSF Response: “White Officers” and FSF “Children”

¹¹ Some of the War Department’s color-coded plans were admittedly outlandish, including, for example, War Plan Red, which outlined how to repel a Canadian invasion. Others, however, were eerily prescient, particularly War Plan Orange, which anticipated Japanese encroachment against U.S. possessions in the Pacific.

Skepticism over the Scouts and Constabulary never reached consensus among U.S. military officials. After all, the U.S. overcame its hesitancy and did create, even at times celebrate, these forces. As early as 1901, The Philippine Commission concluded that the “time is ripe” for local scouts and constabulary units (Senate 1901: 77). Many officials, even those who had doubted FSF reliability, saw in these local forces considerable potential. Perhaps they could actually assist U.S. efforts to conduct counterinsurgencies and enforce order. But what allowed for this pro-FSF position? Why, for instance, could Governor Taft proclaim having “much more confidence in the Filipino and his loyalty than have a good many of the military officers” (Senate 1902: 290)?

While FSF champions shared with skeptics similar views about racial hierarchy, the former, contrary to the latter, felt it possible to manage, if not make use of, racial deficiencies.¹² This pro-FSF position differed from the approach that had delimited the types of weapons put into the hands of in-country forces, especially the hands of Haitian gendarmes and Filipino constables (Millet 2010: 53; Twichell 1974: 124-125). While arming these forces with obsolete weapons reduced their capability to inflict harm on Americans or local populations, it also reduced their capability to defeat well-armed insurgents or bandits. Advocates argued that they could minimize the dangers that FSF posed without compromising battlefield effectiveness. To achieve this outcome, they emphasized the controlling, tempering, civilizing, and uplifting influence of the “White American Officer.” Thus, a principal-agent problem structured by racial hierarchy called upon that same hierarchy in generating mechanisms for tightening agency slack. Legitimizing FSF as beneficial to U.S. interests hinged on making apparent the powers of American officers to control and exploit their native trainees. This pro-FSF view ultimately

¹² In his biography of Allen, for example, Twichell explains that it would be “too much to call Allen a believer in racial equality; he merely had a higher opinion of the abilities and potential of Negroes (and Filipinos) than most of his army contemporaries” (1974: 299-300, n. 48).

triumphed. The policy of developing FSF progressed beyond its initial experimentation phase in the Philippines—with American officers largely in command.

Luke E. Wright, the American Secretary of Commerce and Police in the Philippines, outlined this pro-FSF reasoning and its connection to U.S. interests:

It was asserted...that the native would prove cruel, inefficient, and disloyal. A careful study, however, of oriental peoples, and especially of the Filipino people, caused the [Philippine] Commission to conclude that these fears were groundless, *and that under American direction and leadership*, they would not only prove reliable, but, in addition, could be made far more effective for service to be performed than even a greater number of American soldiers (U.S. War Department 1903: 3, emphasis added).

FSF proponents argued that these local forces could endow the U.S. with military advantages, but only under the proper U.S. tutelage. This tutelage served more than just to monitor FSF agents; it fulfilled the “natural” social arrangement between a “superior race” and an “inferior” one. In this way, racial hierarchy both divided and connected the U.S. principal to its FSF agent. While race distinguished them, it also constituted a relationship in which the former could, through superior standing, bring the latter under control, train it to serve U.S. objectives, and hence render it useful.

Officials drew upon race relations in the United States to link “whiteness” with military authority. In his approach to the Haitian gendarmerie and the Guardia Nacional Dominicana, General Waller embraced the lessons learned from his family’s experience with slave ownership. He reported to his superiors that, “I know the nigger and how to handle him. The same quality is going to be needed in San Domingo as well as here’ ” (quoted in Schmidt 1987: 84). Ward related the experience of local forces in the Philippines to that of American Blacks in the U.S. military. “Like the negro,” he explained, “the Filipino does not want his commander to be of his own people; he does not and will not trust them, while his trust and reliance in his American officers amounts almost to worship.” From this position, then, “the higher standard of the

Americans in everything is one that they emulate. His strength, strictness, and justness, win their respect and admiration, and they readily serve, giving their love and respect to their officers, one whom they consider their superior” (1902: 803). Seaman drew the parallel even more starkly. He described how all native soldiers—including the “negro, the Egyptian, or the Malay”—crave the “inspiration and leadership of resolute white officers.” And these officers, in turn, fashion effective FSF from native material. “That the yellow and black races make excellent fighting material, *when properly officered by whites*, has been proved conclusively in innumerable instances.” As an example of such an instance, Seaman pointed to the assault on San Juan Hill during the Spanish-American War, in which “negro troops, *led by their gallant white American officers*, did as effective work as any men, regulars or volunteers, on the field” (1900: 853, emphasis added).

For FSF proponents, the natives’ racial character required, but also facilitated, the controlling influence of American officers. On one hand, the Filipinos demanded the “immediate control of American officers” (War Department 1904b: 135). On the other, their “subordinate position” allowed them to be “easily led and influenced” (Ward 1902: 802, 804). And so, in rhetoric praising FSF development as successful, variations on the caveat, “but only if properly handled” appear often. “In a fight,” Powell observed, the Filipino “must be led.” Native forces, he argued, “will be reliable enough if we give them good officers” (1900: 338, 339). General Hughes echoed Powell: “they have to be led. They can not be commanded as you command white troops” (Senate 1902: 572). Munro, himself an FSF trainer, felt confident that the presence of American trainers would transform raw native recruits into an “effective soldiery.” In his accounts of training Filipino Scouts, Munro felt that “with American officers,” the scouts “can be made self-sustaining in every way.” The Filipino “material is excellent...All he needs is just and

careful handling” (1905: 183, 185, 188). Similarly, Ward explained that the Filipinos “readily attach themselves to the right kind of man, and show him the greatest reverence and gratitude; are then truthful, reliable, and contented to serve.” Ward described Filipinos “as men, who, in certain respects, are like boys.” American officers must animate “the warrior spirit [that] is dormant within them all.” These natives, “when well led,” will “rush on with undaunted courage, always in front” (1902: 797). Before the Committee on the Philippines, Governor Taft proffered a similar defense of the Filipino Scouts: “under the command of American officers they would be entirely loyal” (Senate 1902: 290). And in his report to the Philippine Commission, Allen made clear that the “efficiency, loyalty, and zeal of constabulary detachment or scout companies are measured by the fitness and character of the officers commanding them” (War Department 1903: 46). Finally, the Secretary of War explained how a “well officered” FSF “can be made faithful and effective, can be trusted with arms, and will be an element of constantly increasing value in the maintenance of order” throughout the Philippines (War Department 1904b: 212).

Many found a solution to their skepticism of Haitian gendarmerie reliability in the transformative, uplifting effects of American officers. As General Cole reported to the Senate inquiry on U.S. operations in Haiti and Santo Domingo, the “contrast between the former Haitian soldier and the present gendarme is the best object lesson as to what can actually be done with the Haitian of the lower and middle classes when under the direct supervision of American officers.” Cole pointed to the gendarmerie as evidence of “what American officers and men can do with the Haitian when in full control.” Another Marine general remarked from “personal observation” the “marked improvement” in the quality of the gendarmerie. Such an improvement, he figured, was “due to the zeal, energy, efficiency, and personal characteristics of the officer in charge of this unit.” From his own experience as a trainer, Colonel Williams saw

American officers as imperative to the institutional success of the gendarmerie. The “only regenerative influence in the gendarmerie was the American influence,” he declared before an audience of Senators. Without these officers “to organize, train, discipline and operate the gendarmerie according to our American conceptions of what was right and proper, we felt that the gendarmerie would remain what the Haitians desired it to remain, a Haitian organization, and consequently of little efficiency” (1922: 1780, 1782, 1741, 553). And finally, May Wise, a Marine trainer working in the Caribbean, was surprised to discover that his “predecessors had discouraged target practice on the theory that it was dangerous to teach the natives how to shoot. Some day they might possibly turn against us!” He found it “damned foolishness to say that black troops couldn't fight.” As he explained, “I had seen the Senegalese in France, and they fought as well as any white troops in the world. I knew that black troops had always fought well when they had a white officer to lead them” (1929: 309-310).

The most vocal defense of the Haitian Gendarmerie came from its first commander, Major Butler. As Butler saw it, he and his fellow FSF developers acted as “trustees of a huge estate that belonged to minors.” These “minors,” he argued, required American supervision and guidance. And through their influence, American officers had solidified the gendarmes' fidelity. In his Senate testimony, Butler expended much energy addressing a question that no one had asked, but to which Butler nevertheless felt required an answer. Yes, he emphasized, Haitians gendarmes had proven themselves loyal. Preempting any concerns from the Senate committee, Butler declared that never “has any disloyalty on the part of a gendarme occurred.” And not only were the gendarmes loyal; they also demonstrated a particularly acute devotion to their White officers. Butler reported that he had awarded “three gendarmes who gave their arms and their legs for their white officers” with the Haitian medal of honor. “Now,” Butler said before the

Senate committee, “you see why the American officers like these gendarmes. They will give their lives for you any time” (Senate 1922: 516, 514-515). By emphasizing the gendarmes’ zealous commitment to their officers, Butler explicitly confronted any implicit skepticism of Haitian security forces. Moreover, his defense of these forces racialized the gendarmerie’s military hierarchy. For Butler and other FSF developers, the gendarmes’ absolute, near suicidal, loyalty resulted from their subordinate race, not just their subordinate rank.

A report on the “Philippine infantry” illustrated how employing racial subordinates could actually enhance battlefield effectiveness, but only in conjunction with white officer leadership. “Paradoxically,” the report observed, “the very ignorance of the average Filipino, together with his conviction of the mental superiority of his American leaders, makes fire control over him more feasible than over more intelligent Americans.” While American enlisted soldiers have “a sense of their equality with their officers,” a Filipino, “trained to believe that his officers will see to his subsistence, comfort and safety, places utmost confidence in their ability to fight, and asks no reasons why.” As long as a white officer “has won his confidence, he will take formations and entire zones of fire, which would lead the more intelligent American to consider personal risk and hesitate” (F0857). The report concluded by establishing the conditions under which the U.S. could guarantee FSF reliability and hence maximize their usefulness: “To develop a native soldier who is going to materially assist in maintaining the authority of the United States in the Philippines, will require severe discipline, constant and conscientious work on the part of the officers and infinite patience” (F0865).

Finally, confidence in the influence of American officers over FSF allowed the U.S. to partially bypass a common practice of colonial administration. As a form of divide-and-rule imperialism, this practice intensified extant ethnic cleavages by deploying native police to

regions from which they did not originate. Such a strategy, favored by Great Britain and Spain, minimized the temptation for the police to side with the local population against the colonial overseer. In agency theory terminology, this strategy operated as an agency slack countermeasure. When it deployed the Philippine Constabulary, however, the U.S. sought the “opposite course.”¹³ As Wright explained, the Philippine Commission felt that “there is great advantage in having the police operating in a particular province familiar with its terrain and the people living therein.” The U.S., in seeking this advantage, thus had to secure loyalty within the constabulary without resorting to ethnic manipulation. To accomplish this, it relied on the influence of American officers, who could, given their elevated racial status, command native forces, even against their own kinsmen. This presumed influence offered U.S. policymakers an alternative enforcement mechanism. It facilitated the Commission’s decision to deemphasize what had been a popular approach to colonial rule. “With proper treatment”—i.e., with proper American officer tutelage—Wright felt that “there need be no fear of treachery” (War Department 1903: 4). Thus while the U.S. attributed the failings of FSF to their racial inferiority, it attributed their successes to the racially superior officers who commanded them.

The Trailblazing FSF Proponent

During the U.S. occupation of the Philippines, Matthew Batson played a particularly influential role as FSF developer and defender. He deserves much of the credit for initiating the FSF “experiment.” Together with Major General Henry Lawton, his mentor and fellow FSF proponent, Batson was among the first to insist that Filipino security forces could, under the right

¹³ This was true of the Philippine Constabulary, but not for the Philippine Scouts. In the beginning, the U.S.’s use of particular tribes (e.g., the Macabebes) for scout units followed the Spanish model. The Macabebes had made many enemies from their previous service within Spain’s colonial occupation. The U.S.’s decision to consider them as FSF and their willingness to volunteer their services were certainly based on ethnic politics.

circumstances, advance rather than hinder U.S. counterinsurgency efforts in the Philippines. For a military officer serving in the American occupation, Batson took a number of heterodox positions. Besides advocating FSF development when it was unfashionable to do so, he also criticized the harsh measures employed against the indigenous population. He doubted the merits of U.S. adventurism abroad. And, contrary to those like Waller, he admired the Filipinos and their culture.¹⁴ Relative to his contemporaries and colleagues, Batson's views towards the native population appear progressive and compassionate. Indeed, his fondness for Filipinos fueled his defense of deploying them on the battlefield.

But like Waller and other FSF developers, Batson remained committed to placing American officers in command of FSF units. In a newspaper interview, Batson justified his assertion that “one regiment of natives can do more work and give less trouble than two regiments of white men.” To an incredulous journalist, Batson explained his “many reasons” for having such an opinion, including the Filipinos’ familiarity with the “country and its conditions,” their meager “requirements for subsistence” and their “amen[ability] to discipline under white officers.” The journalist pushed this last point further: “you think, then that satisfactory results can only be reached under the training and command of white officers?” Batson response was, “Certainly; the moral influence of the white man is greater, and everywhere he comes into contact with the Oriental it is felt and seen...*If handled with firmness and tact the respect and loyalty of native soldiers can be won and retained*” (F0716, emphasis added).

¹⁴ In a letter to his wife, Batson criticized the Christian missionaries that the American occupation had brought to the Philippines: “I find [the Filipinos] exceedingly interesting people—and when you hear of our people sending missionaries here tell them they had better put their missionaries to work in New York” (F0798). In another letter, he complained about the conduct of American troops and their penchant to burn villages and terrorize the locals: “The Spaniards may have oppressed these people: They taught them Christianity, built them large churches. We come as a Christian people to relieve [sic] them from the Spanish yoke and bear ourselves like barbarians” (F0800).

Despite his admiration for the Filipinos' culture and his skepticism of U.S. colonial policy, he advocated placing Filipinos under the direct control of the same colonial power responsible for practices he deemed excessively harsh. To advocate otherwise, to entrust local forces to serve U.S. policy *without* American officers, would have transcended the range of acceptability within the FSF policy debates of the era. Not even Batson, with his progressive racial views, could articulate it. There were simply no rhetorical resources available for legitimizing this alternative, and certainly less expensive, approach to outsourcing security to native forces. While different rhetorical resources would not have eliminated the agency problem altogether, they would have defined it differently, so that policies other than American command over FSF units would become appropriate as agency slack countermeasures.

Like his contemporaries, Batson held that white officers proved instrumental in harnessing the natives' martial qualities. But he took this position further; he argued that to exploit those qualities required officers who possessed an anthropological knowledge of native culture. This view further distinguished Batson from his contemporaries. In treating this knowledge as a means of accomplishing U.S. military objectives, Batson eschewed coercion and blatant racial denigration. Instead, he required that officers demonstrate a curiosity about the population from which they intended to raise soldiers. This willingness to understand the Filipinos was essential if U.S. officers intended to train them with "tact." Batson thus saw knowledge of the Other as a necessary precondition for engaging with it. In an early diary entry, he admitted his trepidation in training foreign peoples with whom he lacked much experience. "It was because I feared the Makabebes [sic] would not be loyal that I hesitated...I...felt that their loyalty might possibly depend a great deal upon the officer who commanded them and for this reason I felt that it would probably be best to select some officer more enimately [sic] acquainted

with the native character...” (F0774). Finally embracing his role as a leader of native scouts, Batson sought the cultural competence necessary to train and deploy them. For Batson, knowledge of their “character” would facilitate their integration into counterinsurgency operations. Subsequent FSF proponents echoed Batson’s emphasis on cross-cultural awareness. In congressional testimony from 1928, for example, Colonel Quinlan of the Philippine Constabulary praised its continuing loyalty, but added that the “Filipino people are the most orderly people on earth *when handled by officers who understand them*” (House 1928: 12, emphasis added).

Batson’s method to raising FSF was among the first to conceive of American officers as paternal figures caring for dependent, potentially troublesome “children” who nevertheless bore great potential. As one newspaper report noted, the Macabebes “show deep respect for their American officers—a respect which closely borders on love—and in return they are treated with the utmost kindness” (F0732). Another report highlighting Batson’s exploits commended him for dealing so astutely with “these children of the forest” (F0874). Accounts of training “Batson’s Macabebe Scouts” celebrated Batson’s influence over his native wards, not just in disciplining them, but also in making them thrive as soldiers. As one account explained, “Batson would make good cavalymen out of the clumsiest, most awkward creatures on earth. They would believe him and follow him anywhere.” Such fidelity had an unmistakable familial quality, given how the natives “look[ed] on their officers as a child would look on its father” (Ward 1902: 801).

Batson’s approach to FSF development in the Philippines demonstrates just how broadly accepted the notion was that American officers should command native security units. Even though Batson embraced the culture of his Filipino soldiers, he failed to see them as officer material. Instead, they represented potentially useful instruments of American occupation, whose

usefulness depended on the cultural competency of the American officers commanding them. Batson's anthropology was ultimately in the service of learning how best to exert control and turn Filipinos into compliant agents.

The Question of Native Officers

Within the pro-FSF position, the question of enlisted soldiers/constables earned praise. The question of native officers, however, elicited considerable skepticism. After all, this position relied on American officers, not native officers, as the *sine qua non* of FSF development. Again, racial hierarchy colored arguments against commissioning officers from the indigenous population.

Some U.S. officials did advocate drawing noncommissioned officers and low-ranking commissioned officers from the FSF ranks "as a reward for loyal and efficient services" (Senate 1901: 79; Senate 1908: 1). But to those responsible for training native officers, the "prospects looked bleak." In the Dominican Republic, Fellowes compared the "dignified bearing" of his native officer trainees to the "dignity of a child playing grown-up...soon discarded for some childish squabble, or youthful frivolity" (1923: 219, 220). Charles Williams, another Marine trainer, acknowledged that while the official agreement on the Guardia Nacional Dominicana stipulated American captains supported by *Dominican* lieutenants, in practice, the number of Dominican officers remained far below the quota. This was "so that the organization will be better able to reach a high standard of efficiency under American rules" (1918: 198). Indeed, the State Department wanted " 'white officers and not native Dominicans' " leading the Guardia (quoted in Calder 2006: 58). Only "white officers," argued State Department representatives, could maintain its "efficiency" (quoted in Millet 2010: 81). U.S. officials feared that without

American officers present, native officers would either fail to maintain competent units, or worse, abuse their authority and terrorize the local population. Taft made clear that “to put in command of a Filipino a thousand men with a thousand rifles would not be wise.” Such a regiment, lacking American supervision, would likely “oppress its own people” (1902: 290). U.S. policy, therefore, refused to envision FSF units led entirely by native officers.

For further evidence of U.S. reluctance to abandon FSF units to native officers, I cite Douglas’s firsthand study of the American occupation of Haiti. In it, he described how the Haitians “feel that not enough of their number have been trained for officers.” While the U.S.’s treaty with Haiti provided for the eventual replacement of Americans by Haitian officers “when they have shown by examination...that they are fit for command,” progress towards such a transition had proceeded slowly (Senate 1922: 282). “After twelve years of the occupation,” Douglass explained, “their army has not been allowed to have enough native leaders to enable it to be truly a National Army.” Instead, gendarmerie units often fall under the command of noncommissioned Marine officers or even privates. “The American domination over [the gendarmerie],” he concluded, “is quite complete” (1927: 368-69). Such domination meant that American privates enjoyed greater opportunities for command over the gendarmerie than did the native gendarmes themselves.

Before the Senate inquiry into the U.S. occupation of Haiti, General Barnett addressed this question of whether Haitian officers should serve in the gendarmerie. “Our intention,” he said, “was originally as fast as possible to make the Haitians junior officers and see if they could not soon be in a position to become captains of companies. That was the thought at the time” (Senate 1922: 448). Later, General Butler draws upon familiar notions of racial difference to explain why such a “thought” had been misguided. According to Butler, Haiti’s previous

experience with a gendarmerie commanded by “natives with black blood” had gone poorly. “When the test was put upon them they did not stand.” Given this, the Marines opted to employ “but three colored officers.” And the marines found even these select Haitian officers wanting. Butler finally admitted having “very little success with the Haitian officer.” He noted that Haitians, “as noncommissioned officers, controlled by the marines,” proved “most excellent.” But, he warned, “when independent authority was handed to them, they became too brutal.” When asked about the prospect of an officer training school in Haiti, Butler responded by dismissing the idea of Haitian officers altogether. “If I had charge,” he declared, “I would appoint no Haitian officers of the gendarmerie, because they will abuse the natives. It is instinctive with them to abuse the inhabitants whenever they are given power. I would not have them” (Senate 1922: 517, 534, 601-602).

Colonel Williams responded similarly to this Senate inquiry. When asked about the “reasonable possibility of the Haitians qualifying as efficient officers, even junior officers, of a gendarmerie ...officered in its higher ranks entirely by Americans,” Williams replied by “doubt[ing] very much if an efficient military police can be maintained in Haiti with the commissioned personnel largely Haitians” (Senate 1922: 517, 534, 601-602). Evidently, maintaining Americans in command failed to calm fears that even junior-grade Haitian officers would compromise the gendarmerie’s institutional integrity.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have attempted to begin filling the lacuna left by a strictly rational choice approach to principal-agent theorizing. Specifically, I used U.S. policy debates over FSF development to identify and analyze the discursive basis of the U.S.-FSF principal-agent

problem. When the U.S. principal considered raising local forces as agents to serve its foreign policy in the Philippines, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, worries over their competence, loyalty, and restraint revealed the specific agency costs at hand. Such costs reflected popular conceptions of racial difference that equated cultural difference with inferiority and barbarity. That is, U.S. officials worried about these local forces, not because they were agents and thus guileful (a tautology), but because they were agents whose racial type suggested specific forms of agency slack. My discursive analysis of foreign policy texts from the period shows how the rhetorical invocation of racial hierarchy connected native forces' racial identity to the risks they posed. FSF became threatening for specific reasons, and in specific ways, when U.S. foreign policy discourse constructed and denigrated them as racial Others.

Moreover, this racial hierarchy, while engendering anxiety about delegating security responsibilities to “inferiors,” also indicated to U.S. officials how best to bring them under control. The basis for this principal-agent problem pinpointed for the principal the kinds of mechanisms necessary to produce compliant agents. If racial inferiority substantiated the agency problem, then, U.S. officials argued, racial superiority, in the form of the White American Officer, would provide the ideal solution. To the detriment of a professionalized, well-developed indigenous officer corps, American officers mostly commanded FSF units until the early 1930s, when the U.S. finally disengaged from direct involvement in the Philippines and the Caribbean.

In the next chapter, I trace the second cluster of debates among U.S. policymakers over outsourcing security to foreigners. While the first cluster revolved around the agency problem of security proxies as racial inferiors, the second cluster centered on the problem of local forces becoming political opportunists, prone to using U.S. training and arms for political intrigue.

Chapter 4:

Professionalism, Partisanship, and Agency: U.S. FSF Development in the Caribbean Basin, 1899-1933

Introduction

This chapter reveals the second agency problem that United States officials identified and confronted in the development of foreign security forces (FSF). While racial hierarchy structured the first agency problem, a hierarchy of military professionalism structured the second. By the early 20th century, the U.S. military had adopted much of the professional ethos that we would recognize in today's modern militaries, including a specialized knowledge in the art of war, a distinct corporate identity, and an apolitical orientation. When the U.S. intervened in Cuba (intermittently between 1898 and 1912), the Dominican Republic¹⁵ (1916-1924), and Nicaragua (1927-1933), the State Department and military found no such orientation among the local security forces. Instead, they found nominal armies, led by local strongmen (*caudillos*), serving political parties instead of the state. These partisan armies had disrupted elections, conducted coups, and thrown their countries into civil war. Such unrest had led to debt crises, which jeopardized American business interests, not to mention the U.S.'s growing regional hegemony. To uphold the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, the U.S. sought to minimize

¹⁵ Racism and progressivism both shaped this period of U.S. foreign relations history. These discourses drew attention to particular forms of alterity where they appeared most pronounced to American officials: racial alterity among FSF in the Philippines and Haiti and professional alterity among FSF in Nicaragua and Cuba. In the Dominican Republic, however, both definitions of otherness came to the foreground. Given that each empirical chapter investigates a particular definition of the FSF agency problem, the Dominican Republic is thus discussed in both this chapter and the previous one. The U.S.'s experience in that country shows how multiple definitions of the agency problem can exist at the same time. Constructivist principal-agent theory disentangles those definitions and shows them as analytically distinct, producing distinct but related policy outcomes. In the Dominican Republic, for example, U.S. officials sought to correct racial deficiencies among the local forces *and* sought to de-politicize them.

conditions that would give European creditors a pretext to meddle in the Western Hemisphere (Abrahamson 1981: 81).

From the U.S.'s perspective, politicized security forces in the Caribbean basin had catalyzed the very disorder that a military intervention would need to check. Foreign policy success thus hinged on disbanding the partisans and creating nonpartisan, national security forces in their place. These new forces, designed as army/police hybrids, were tasked with defeating banditry and organized insurgencies (such as Augusto Sandino's in Nicaragua) and with protecting private property and republican government. Expectations for the constabularies only increased as the U.S., increasingly uncomfortable with the moral and monetary costs of overt imperialism, began its withdrawal from foreign occupations. These local forces would eventually have to maintain their apolitical professionalism without direct American oversight.

Strategic imperatives alone fail to account for why the U.S. would necessarily see politicized FSF as a problem. Certainly, disorder threatened American business and enticed European states to intervene in a region claimed by the U.S. But the U.S. could have rectified that disorder without apolitical security proxies. Indeed, during the Cold War, the U.S. showed little compunction about encouraging foreign militaries to embrace, not reject, political involvement, precisely for the sake of protecting internal order and warding off external meddling (this will be explored in the following chapter). In the Caribbean and Central America of the early 20th century, the U.S. could have most likely achieved its strategic objectives by doing the same—empowering military politicization, disrespecting civilian authority, and sponsoring agreeable military dictatorships. During this time, however, the U.S. tried to export a civil-military relationship that would uphold civilian authority, republican government, even democracy. Why?

Constructivist principal-agent theory provides an answer. The U.S.'s emphasis on military professionalism abroad stemmed from Progressive Era reforms at home. These reforms, which took effect in the late 1800s and early 1900s, stressed technical efficiency, scientific management, and nonpartisan expertise. They transformed many institutions, including the “apparatus of United States diplomatic and military operations,” which “professionalized” during this period (Israel 1972: 181). When this apparatus intervened abroad, its new professional identity came with it and brought into sharp relief disparities between the U.S. military and local forces. The disparity in apolitical expertise, in particular, gave U.S. officials reason to doubt these local forces as replacements for American Marines and soldiers. These forces became suspect not because they were agents and thus prone to misbehavior (a tautology), but because they flouted the nonpartisan ethos that a modern, efficient civil-military relationship required. From the perspective of U.S. officials within newly professionalized institutions, partisanship defined FSF alterity.

This alterity meant more than just inferior difference. It also specified the agency costs of delegating security responsibilities to these partisan forces. A lack of military professionalism thus established the social basis of the FSF agency problem. From the U.S.'s perspective, FSF threatened to engage in unwanted behaviors so long as they remained politicized. In this way, abstract agency costs concretized in concerns over the vulnerability of agents to local politicians, or worse, to their own opportunism. The U.S. worried that these security proxies would exploit the authority delegated to them to advance a narrow political agenda instead of a modern civil-military relationship. Partisanship thus defined not only the salient difference between U.S. forces and FSF, but also what made these FSF imperfect, potentially counterproductive security proxies.

As the occupying power, the U.S. set to work rebuilding the local security institutions. Constructivist principal-agent theory explains why neutralizing partisanship dominated this rebuilding effort. Defining partisanship as the social basis of the agency problem delimited the effort required to tighten agency slack, i.e., to cover the agency costs and correct the agent's misbehavior. That effort translated into three countermeasures. First, and most explicitly, the U.S. codified political neutrality in treaties, official orders, and in recruitment and promotion rules. Second, the U.S. insisted on officering FSF units with American military personnel for as long as possible, assuming that apolitical Americans—and only Americans—would impart, or at least enforce, a respect for constitutional government and an aversion to political intrigue. And third, in a concession to entrenched party loyalties, the U.S. raised FSF units composed equally of Conservatives and Liberals, hoping to balance out and then cancel out political affiliations. Ultimately, U.S. officials adopted an approach to raising and recruiting FSF that stressed nonpartisanship. The logic of that approach only emerges from a definition of the agency problem that associated partisanship with agency slack and nonpartisanship with reliability.

In the following sections, I first establish that the Progressive Era reforms towards professionalism, specifically towards apolitical efficiency, saturated the social milieu of the U.S. military and State Department. Second, I show how this commitment to professionalism provided the rhetorical resources with which U.S. officials could then articulate their worries about FSF development. Third, I demonstrate how the U.S. attempted to increase FSF reliability by de-politicizing them. And finally, I note how U.S. FSF development in these countries paradoxically facilitated the very politicization and corruption that the U.S. had hoped to avoid. I use this finding to settle the controversy over the objectives of early 20th century American interventions in the Caribbean. The eventual outcome of those interventions provides a timely

warning for policymakers. Engendering apolitical security agents is a risky enterprise, especially when you help those agents claim a monopoly on the use of violence where no such monopoly had existed before.

Setting the Context: Professionalism and Nonpartisanship

Worries over partisanship dominated the U.S.'s approach to FSF development in Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba during the early 20th century. In response, the U.S. military and the State Department made it their mission to rid these countries of partisan security forces and to create nonpartisan forces in their place. According to constructivist principal-agent theory, this mission makes sense only if the principal's discourse already emphasized professionalism, because that emphasis provides the logical foundation for identifying de-politicization as the salient agency cost. Otherwise, the U.S.'s de-politicizing efforts could appear as a *de novo* response to the situation on the ground, rather than as a projection and application of preexisting discourse. Because military and civilian officials constitute the principal in this instance, constructivist principal-agent theory shines a light on the social environment of both actors. If they share a discourse of professionalism and an appreciation for an apolitical military, then my account holds. If they do not, then the functionalist argument gains credence.

In the previous chapter, I posited that scientific racism filtered the worldview of U.S. military officers and civilian policymakers in the early 20th century. That assumption runs into little scholarly resistance. But positing that professionalism filtered the worldview of military and civilian officials during the same period runs into Samuel Huntington. In *The Soldier and the State* (1957), Huntington describes how the views of civilian leaders and military officers

diverged precisely when the latter began professionalizing. He argues that the U.S. military's professionalism developed in isolation from civilian influences after the Civil War and bore little resemblance to the "business pacifist" values of American society. In fact, Huntington explains, that civil-military split proved essential to the U.S. military's transformation. While isolation and rejection "reduced the size of the services and hampered technological advance," it also gave the military the latitude necessary to "develop a distinctive military character" (1957: 229).

A defining feature of this character was nonpartisanship, an ethos Huntington attributes to General William Sherman's tenure as Commanding General of the Army (1869-1883). As Huntington explains, "Sherman was particularly adamant in stressing the divorce of the military from politics" (231). This "divorce" marked a break from the past. "In sharp contrast to the opinions of the officer corps in the 1830s," Huntington explains, "after the Civil War officers unanimously believed that politics and officership did not mix" (258). Now, the "concept of an impartial, nonpartisan, objective career service, loyally serving whatever administration or party was in power, became the ideal for the military profession" (259). This concept continued into the 20th century, gaining popularity among officers in the Army and the Navy (of which the Marine Corps was a part).¹⁶ Both services came to revere Carl von Clausewitz and "referred to the armed forces as 'instruments' of the government" (307). As subscribers to the Prussian model, military officers executed policy; they did not make it. For Huntington, this golden era of military professionalism ended with World War II, when American generals like Douglas MacArthur became vocal in political decisions (315).

¹⁶ According to Allan R. Millet, the Marine Corps responded to the "charge that Army and Navy officers set standards of enlightened military leadership the Marines could not match" by establishing its own School of Application in 1891. So while the Marines lagged behind in their professional development, they did eventually come to share the professional ethos of the Army and Navy (Millet 1989: 46).

Huntington's account creates a problem for the application of constructivist principal-agent theory to U.S. FSF development in the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Cuba. If Huntington is right, then constructivist principal-agent theory can only account for why the military would want to impart this nonpartisan spirit to its foreign counterparts. It cannot also explain why civilian officials wanted to do the same. Huntington argues that civilians failed to appreciate the "distinctive military character" in the U.S.'s own armed forces; this argument suggests that they would have also failed to appreciate this character in the development of *foreign* security forces. And yet, the historical record shows the State Department joining the military in worrying about FSF partisanship. Like the military, the State Department treated FSF development as a crucial opportunity to export "objective civilian control" (Huntington 1957). How is this the case?

The answer is that the concept of professionalism enjoyed far more currency across American society than Huntington acknowledges. Before Huntington wrote *The Soldier and the State*, Brown had already argued that the views of American military officers "did not differ from the attitudes held by 'other leaders in American life' " (quoted in Gates 1980: 38). *The Soldier and The State* seems to refute Brown's argument, but research conducted since 1957 rescues it. Janowitz (1960), Guttman (1965), and Machoian (2006: 193) challenge Huntington's general notion that military officers exist apart from society. Others challenge Huntington's specific claim that military professionalization occurred without civilian influence. Rather than operating in isolation, argues Nenninger, military reformers "were products of their time" (1978: 8). As Lane explains, the military "drew heavily upon non-military developments taking place in the American society...the professional military progress occurred not in isolation, as it is sometimes claimed, but with the help and support of civilians" (1973: 3). This "help and

support” was apparent in 1903, for example, “in the creation of the General Staff,” which reflected the “work of civilian outsiders” (Lane 1973: 5). Gates affirms this civil-military link, noting that, “officers were not isolated from the main currents of American thought and action” (41). Instead, their attitudes “kept rather singular pace with the shifts in American civilian attitudes” (Abrahamson 1981: 100). Officers, like their civilian counterparts, were caught up in the “pervasive professionalization of American society” (Shulimson 1996: 231). They saw that “military problems, like corporate and public problems, could be solved through effective organization and management” (Lane 1973: 5). Pace Huntington, this research strongly suggests that civilian values infiltrated the military and led to its professionalization.

If Huntington’s critics are correct in treating the military’s professionalization as exogenous rather than endogenous, then elements of that professionalization should be traceable to civilian sources and apparent in civilian institutions. In particular, the element of nonpartisanship, so crucial to the “distinctive military character,” should have been familiar to those outside of military circles in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. If, as criticism of Huntington suggests, nonpartisan expertise reflected a broad societal discourse, not just a new military ethos, then we can begin to make sense of the shared civil-military anxiety over FSF partisanship in the Caribbean.

I find that broad discourse in Progressive Era reforms, which linked efficiency—a concept applicable to any organization—with nonpartisanship. Efficiency, writes Lane, offered reformers in the late 19th and early 20th centuries a “panacea for a wide variety of political, social, and economic problems” (1973: 4). The engine of efficiency, “scientific management,” left little room for politics, because politics crippled disinterested problem solving and institutional effectiveness. In the view of Progressive reformers, politics unleashed passion,

corruption, and chaos, but scientific management promoted the opposite—rationality, transparency, and order. Progressivism thus held that solving societal problems could and should remain an apolitical process, because the “traditional compromises of politics” stalled progress (Abrahamson 1981: 106). From this view, a well-organized society operated like a business, regulated by expertise and objective analysis, rather than by incompetence or partisan ideology. Such a business excised waste while maximizing efficiency by employing professionals who eschewed politics.

Reforms in the U.S. military and the State Department were explicit in linking efficiency with nonpartisanship. For instance, the creation of the military’s General Staff in 1903 represented “the principles of scientific management-expertism, non-partisan leadership and, particularly, efficiency.” Leading this General Staff required the quintessential professional, a “non-partisan with regard not only to politics, but also to factions within the officers’ corps” (Lane 1973: 6). A professional officer, in other words, dwelled on the efficient application of violence rather than on the political objectives that that violence served. Dwelling on the latter would necessarily come at the expense of the former, because it would encourage political identification and participation as opposed to the study of war. Politics would thus render a military corrupt, inefficient, and unable to discharge its duties as a fighting organization. Nonpartisanship, on the other hand, would maximize the military’s efficiency by channeling all of its energies towards securing the state. In this way, Huntington’s functional justification for “objective civilian control” hinges on the logic of efficiency articulated within the Progressive Movement. This logic elucidates why a military free from political affiliation also “maximizes the likelihood of achieving military security” (Huntington 1957: 85). Given finite time and

resources, the military that chooses to study war over politics will be better prepared to protect the state.

The State Department underwent changes to its consular and diplomatic services (in 1906 and 1924, respectively) that also promoted businesslike, nonpartisan efficiency. This might seem curious, given that as an organ of the Executive Branch, the State Department helps to formulate foreign policy, not just carry it out. But as Israel explains, reformers in the State Department championed a “philosophy of efficiency” as a corporate identity that would allow the department to transcend “political winds” in policy formulation (1972: 191). When, for instance, Woodrow Wilson appointed the polarizing William Jennings Bryan as Secretary of State, some worried that State Department officials would resign in protest. Reformers, however, felt that rationalizing the operations of the State Department would stabilize “political fluctuations” (190). One prominent reformer, Wilbur J. Carr, expressed “confidence that what has been done toward lifting the organization to a higher plane of efficiency will be retained, as will the really efficient members of the service” (quoted in Israel 1972: 190). For the reformers, this “all embracing ideology” of efficiency insulated the State Department from political vicissitudes and thus de-politicized its role in foreign-policy making. Efficiency became “an end in itself.” Like the military, the State Department’s consular and diplomatic services came to represent “both a symbolic and pragmatic tool in the larger sense of ‘service’ to the nation” (193). Equipped with the “scientific instruments of United States diplomacy,” the State Department stood ready to weather political appointments and to generate dispassionate solutions to even contentious foreign policy questions (191).

Reforms within the “apparatus of United States diplomatic and military operations” allowed Progressivism to extend outward from domestic to foreign policy. In the aftermath of the

Spanish-American War, this apparatus facilitated imperial administration in the Philippines and Caribbean basin. Under the auspices of the State Department, military officers often acted as de facto proconsuls, exercising considerable authority, especially in places like Cuba and the Dominican Republic, where the U.S. had implanted military governorships. With this authority, officers could funnel Progressivism, particularly its “civilizing” reforms, into imperial administration. This meant drawing from “civilian progressives, whose paternalistic attitude toward America’s own lower class predisposed them to believe that the United States had the responsibility to shape the destinies of ‘less advanced’ peoples” (Abrahamson 1981: 79). As “military progressives,” officers thus saw themselves and their civilian partners as the “appropriate agents” to fix social, economic, and political backwardness wherever the U.S. found it (1981: 79). With the State Department’s coordination and approval, the military implemented “numerous reforms comparable to those being implemented in America at roughly the same time.” For example, it worked to improve “public health and sanitation,” to correct economic and administrative mismanagement, and to build public works (Gates 1980: 40; Calder 2006: 50).

As Gobat explains, this reform agenda pursued “stability by inculcating native elites with the technocratic, apolitical ideals that marked the U.S. ideology of Progressivism” (2005: 126). I argue that by informing the U.S.’s broad approach to foreign interventions, this “ideology” also guided its specific approach to raising and training foreign security proxies. As I demonstrate below, social and economic reforms were not the only projects on the U.S. agenda. Military reform was another major goal. For the sake of improving the efficiency of local security forces, the U.S. sought to render them nonpartisan with new “professional standards” (Kuzmarov 2009: 194). Given that its own military had recently professionalized along comparable lines, the U.S. was well suited to apply this model where it seemed most lacking. These new “constabularies

represented the very opposite of the caudillo armies they replaced; they were to be nonpartisan, professionalized forces based on bureaucratic ('scientific') principles, not personalism" (Gobat 2005: 206). They were, in other words, to reflect the ideal of nonpartisan efficiency so central to the U.S. military's corporate identity in particular and to the Progressive Era in general.

Establishing this Progressive Era context accounts for why U.S. officials—from both the military and State Department—found partisan local armed forces in Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and Cuba so troubling as prospective security proxies. In the next section, I provide evidence of how the threat of partisanship informed U.S. concerns about their reliability.

FSF Anxiety: Partisanship

U.S. foreign policy in Cuba, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic confronted a dilemma: either prolong the occupations by relying on American military forces indefinitely or delegate security responsibilities to dubious foreigners. On the one hand, U.S. officials were eager to replace American soldiers and Marines with local forces who could maintain order and uphold duly elected governments on their own. On the other, they saw these forces as a potential liability to U.S. foreign policy goals, given their traditional attachment to party over state. This attachment rendered them erratic and unprofessional as security organizations, more prone to exacerbating disorder than calming it. U.S. officials thus expressed frustration with the *caudillismo* that had dominated military affairs in the Caribbean basin and which now threatened to stifle U.S. plans. They warned that *caudillismo* could infiltrate U.S.-created constabularies and undercut their value as security proxies.

The historic patterns of civil-military relations in Central American and the Caribbean struck U.S. officials as counterproductive. The diplomat Dr. Dana Gardner Munro explained that

the “old armies were or seemed to be one of the principal causes of disorder and financial disorganization. They consumed most of the government’s revenue, chiefly in graft, and they gave nothing but disorder and oppression in return” (quoted in Millet 2010: 3). Democratization proved impossible in such a setting because, as Secretary of State Henry Stimson explained, “the results of elections were habitually controlled by the man or men who held the machinery of government, including the army and the police” (1927: 8). Marine Lieutenant Colonel Robert Denig echoed this critique, noting that “political differences go hand-in-hand with bitter personal animosities, and the party in power need not consider public opinion, so long as it retains the support of the armed forces and the office holders” (1932: 77).

Partisan armed forces had fostered a “condition of affairs which made the presence of marines necessary” (FRUS, 17 March 1931, Vol. II: 849). One Marine officer warned that Marines would need to police Central America and the Caribbean indefinitely, because a “vicious cycle” of war and poverty hindered the civil-military reforms that could eventually obviate U.S. involvement. Without that reform, he argued, any U.S. program to reorganize local security forces will prove fruitless “and Central America will once again become the stamping ground of United States Marines” (Keyser 1926: 87, 96).

In Nicaragua, U.S. officials made sense of rampant unrest by treating partisanship and party affiliation as essential characteristics of the Nicaraguan disposition. In their study of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua, Marine officers outlined the conditions that had made forming it so difficult:

Party organizations play a most important role in the social, political and economic life of the Republic. Here, party affiliations assume an importance unknown or unequalled in the United States. The bitterness engendered through political strife and rivalries has done much to delay the economic development of the country. Had the interest and time devoted to politics and political intrigue been more wisely devoted to the advancement of the national welfare, business, agricultural or mining, there would have been a greater

development of the country's rich natural resources with the increased wealth and prosperity incident thereto (Smith et al. 1974: 51).

Smith and his coauthors added that, despite U.S. intervention, it remained difficult “to allay a bitterness that has its origin so deeply imbedded in the past and so thoroughly interwoven into the consciousness of a people. *Party feeling has been literally bred into the people from their mother's breasts*” (Ibid, emphasis added). This “party feeling” would undermine professionalism within any security force that the U.S. attempted to raise. Matthew Hanna, the U.S. minister in Nicaragua, told the Secretary of State that a local security force “had had only five years to establish a tradition and to overcome the habits of more than century” (FRUS, 4 November 1932, Vol. V: 877). And Munro recalled that, “almost all Nicaraguans were liberals or conservatives by birth” so the “idea of non-partisanship [in a U.S.-created constabulary], as in any Nicaraguan institution, was unrealistic” (1974: 276).

General Beadle, the Marine officer responsible for forming that Nicaraguan constabulary, explained that the intensity of political strife approached a deep level of sectarian hatred:

It is not sufficient to say that the people of Nicaragua are completely warped by politics... The bitterness is not alone political, it is between families and between localities. Men have been going about in bands killing their enemies of opposite faith and satisfying in this manner their personal hatred. In a larger way there has been a revolution. This is a civil war and engenders the hatreds that accompany it. This feeling of hatred moves the Nicaraguans in all classes and in all walks of life” (quoted in Denny 1928).

As the interviewer summarized, Beadle thus confronted the Herculean task of “making a Nicaraguan Army” in “a country where right has always depended on whether one belonged to the party in power, and... where patriotism has too often been only a banner of exploitation” (Denny 1928). A new constabulary would have to rise above such a poisoned environment.

Beadle emphasized that in “comparison to this”—referring to political instability and corruption

surrounding the constabulary—“the Guardia Nacional has to set an example of impartiality and fair dealing” (quoted in Denny 1928).

The Marine officer who served as *Jefe Director* of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua, General C.B. Matthews, explained the difficulties of maintaining a constabulary in a country plagued by military partisanship and irregularity: “The former military organizations were officered by military appointees commissioned by the government which happened to be in power, and in accordance with the political favors which that government desired to bestow.” This, noted Matthews, forced military personnel to serve at the “whim of the government officials in power.” Without a “permanent corps of officers or any basic law providing for a continuous military organization,” the government of Nicaragua never “had a force upon which it could fully depend to exercise its authority or to maintain it in power during times of internal stress or attempted revolutions.” Matthews warned that the legacy of unprofessional civil-military relations put the Guardia in a precarious position. “For the Guardia organization to revert to the former chaotic condition would be merely to invite disaster.” Any future government would become unable “to exert its authority whenever a revolution is attempted” (FRUS, 16 November 1932, Vol. V: 854-55). In other words, a partisan security force would become weakened by its own corruption and thus fail to protect the state from internal unrest. Such unrest, in turn, would necessitate re-intervention—exactly what the U.S. intended to avoid through FSF development.

Lieutenant Fellowes, one of the Marine instructors for the Guardia Dominicana, described with similar direness the civil-military relations that had existed in the Dominican Republic before the Marines arrived. “In the old days,” he wrote,

the Dominicans had no force which by any stretch of the imagination could be called an army. There existed the Guardia Republicana, or Republican guard, which was supposed

to be a supporting force to the existing Government, but in those days this force was undermined by politics, and presidents came and went with such rapidity that this force was never any value. It had been composed of some three or four hundred ragged, untrained men, under officers as ignorant as themselves, and at the first sign of political unrest quickly went over to the side of the presidential candidate who seemed to be the most powerful and to have the largest war chest (1923: 215-216).

Those conditions gave rise to nominal armies comprising “underfed, badly equipped, inefficient black soldiers” (1923: 233). Such soldiers constituted the questionable “material” from which Fellowes and the other Marine instructors were to mold a Dominican constabulary capable of replacing the Marines.

Skeptical military officers and State Department personnel worried that the new constabularies would slide back into political intrigue; some feared that they had already slid. For instance, in 1928 the U.S. Minister in Nicaragua expressed his dismay over President José María Moncada, the head of Liberal Party and his increasingly feeble commitment to a nonpartisan constabulary: “On various occasions recently General Moncada has expressed to me his opinion that a non-partisan guardia cannot be established at the present time and it is becoming increasingly evident that he intends to make it a partisan organization.” The Minister noted how “recent interferences with the conduct of the guardia” perpetrated by Moncada “are tending to create a spirit of discouragement among the American officers of that organization” (FRUS, 14 February 1929, Vol. III: 615). Moncada’s use of the Guardia in a “policy of imprisoning those whose political activities seem aimed against his administration” struck the Secretary of State as “most unwise.” He feared that it “might very easily lead to greater evils than those which by this means he might seek to overcome” (FRUS 9 November 1929, Vol. III: 605). Concerns that Moncada was indeed turning the Guardia into a “Liberal Army” to “consolidate his political position” elicited strong U.S. condemnation (Nalty 1968: 29). As the Minister told the Secretary of State, “such flagrant and open violation of the letter and spirit of

the Guardia Agreement, if allowed to persist, will largely destroy the effectiveness of the Guardia.” And a politicized Guardia would not only damage itself, but “place the United States in the position of lending its men and influence to maintain in force a regime which is violating its international agreements and the obligations it solemnly incurred toward both the United States and the people of Nicaragua” (FRUS, 30 March 1929, Vol. III: 624). There was little interest among American policymakers in supporting a constabulary claimed by a single political party.

The U.S. felt that re-politicized constabularies would fall back into bad habits. Matthew Hanna, the U.S. minister in Nicaragua, told the Secretary of State that, “if partisan influences are unrestrained in the municipal police forces of the Republic, the beneficial effects of the [Guardia] agreement will be greatly impaired and the abuses it is intended to prevent may be committed without restraint (FRUS, 7 November 1932, Vol. V: 889). The threat that the constabularies would regress became even more acute when U.S. officials considered “the status of the Guardia Nacional after” the U.S.’s departure (FRUS, 16 November 1931, Vol. V: 854). As Hanna told the Secretary of State, “Few persons dare to hope that the present efficiency of the Guardia can be maintained in any large degree, and many actually anticipate the disintegration of that organization” (FRUS, 4 November 1932, Vol. V: 877). Moreover, after the U.S. first left Cuba in 1903, Consul-General Frank M. Streinhart and Matthew Hanna (who at the time was a military attaché) “found the Rural Guard rapidly deteriorating in effectiveness and morale.” These officials “doubted that it could deter political violence or avoid political employment” (Millet 1972: 197).

The constabularies’ long-term reliability depended on the quality of the “native officers” who would eventually be commanding them. Paradoxically, U.S. officials, worried that native

officers might come under the spell of political influence, had delayed the formation of a native officer corps to replace American officers. In the Dominican Republic, for example, distrust of a Dominican officer corps stunted its development. The military government “reserv[ed] all ranks above lieutenant for North Americans, thus assuring officer cadets that there was little chance for promotion” (Calder 2006: 56). U.S. authorities were so distrustful of Nicaraguan officers that they “object[ed] to the commissioning of *two* Nicaraguan officers of high rank” (FRUS, 14 January 1931, Vol. II: 836, emphasis added). And yet, for the U.S. to leave behind a capable constabulary, *many* Nicaraguans would need to “be promptly appointed to the senior grades.” Denig identified these “senior grades” as the main “stumbling block, as politics control the appointment in what was hoped to be a non-partisan military force.” Indeed, he warned that the highest-ranking officers could eventually “all be of the party in power” (Denig 1932: 77). Matthews offered a similar response to the officer question, explaining how Sandino’s ongoing insurgency would give the Nicaraguan president an excuse to stack all levels of the officer corps with loyalists:

[I]t is inconceivable to me that any president will accept or continue in office Nicaraguan officers, of high rank in key positions in the Guardia, of whose personal loyalty to himself and to his party there is the slightest doubt. His Excellency, the present Chief executive, has shown conclusively that party and personal loyalty are large considerations in the appointment of even the present junior officers of the Guardia and of the cadets of the Military Academy, who because of their youth have not yet become seriously involved in politics (FRUS, 8 August 1932, Vol. V: 869).

Matthews argued that “these conditions, the existence of which I believe everyone familiar with” made it “obviously impossible to select for the higher commands of the Guardia” (ibid).

Officials overseeing the Cuban Rural Guard and the Guardia Dominicana expressed similar worries over tainted officer promotions. An audit in 1907 of the Rural Guard exposed how it had “been used as a political agency.” Citing the audit, Provisional Governor Charles

Magoon highlighted “inefficiency resulting from political appointments” and the propensity of the Cuban Government to make “numerous promotions in the service as reward for political activity or because of political influence” (Magoon 1907: 18-19). This came as little surprise to many U.S. Army officers, who had already questioned the Rural Guard’s professionalism. One general “went so far as to call [it] a Spanish anachronism prone to arbitrary force and political ambition” (Millet 1972: 193). Moreover, after the U.S. had left the Dominican Republic, minister William Russell lamented that, “politics is fast destroying the efficiency of the Dominican National Police.” As evidence, he pointed to “several ‘purely political’ personnel decisions,” most notably the “promotion...of Lieutenant Colonel Rafael Trujillo” (quoted in Calder 2006: 61). Native officers threatened to become personally tied to the president in office, or worse, political rulers themselves. This lingering threat had limited the U.S.’s commitment to developing a native officer corps. But that limited commitment only intensified U.S. worries that a cohort of under-professionalized officers would make conditions worse after the American officers went home.

FSF Response: De-Politicization

In response to concerns over the reliability of the constabularies, the U.S. hedged its approach to raising and training them. In particular, the U.S. attempted to guard itself from the dangers that these FSF posed—to both the U.S. and their own states—by confronting their partisanship head on. As Calder explains, one “of the cure-alls which the United States proposed for the Caribbean and Central American states in the early twentieth century was the depolitization of the military” (2006: 54). Munro recounted that the “establishment of nonpartisan constabularies in the Caribbean states was one of the chief objectives of our policy”

(quoted in Millet 2010: 3). Keyser echoed this objective, noting that the State Department “is urging upon these countries [in Central America and the Caribbean] the wisdom of organizing a constabulary force along modern lines and under foreign direction to replace their politically corrupt army and police” (1926: 88). This reform was necessary to give “capital the assurance that it must have to undertake any large and permanent investment” and to stabilize, if not democratize, the political system (ibid). As I demonstrate in this section, the major components of the Progressive Movement discussed above—nonpartisanship, apolitical expertise, and efficiency—coalesced within U.S. discourse on FSF development.

In Nicaragua, the U.S. aimed to “substitute a well-trained, disciplined and non-political force for the politically corrupt, undisciplined forces now existing.” This new force was to be a “[n]ational institution free from political influence and used for the sole purpose of maintaining peace and order” (Keyser 1926: 88, 92). While recognizing that Nicaragua had long suffered under partisan forces, Hanna described how a reformed constabulary gave Nicaraguans hope for the future: their “fears...have been to a considerable extent mitigated by the realization that every effort is being made to organize and train a real non-partisan National Guard, something which the country has never had before” (FRUS, 17 March 1931, Vol. II: 849). Despite signs of politicization within the new Nicaraguan constabulary, Stimson held fast to giving “our full support and confidence to the single, non-partisan and non-political military force which we have always agree was a prime necessity for Nicaragua” (FRUS, 25 November 1931, Vol. II: 827). The U.S.’s democratization campaign made this force particularly important in Nicaragua, as it required the constabulary to monitor elections without biasing them. As Denig explained, this “new force was to be given the mission of conducting a fair election. To this end it had to prevent the intimidation of the voters and fraud at the polling booths, so it would have to be

nonpartisan in composition” (1932: 75). Hence, the Secretary of State concluded that, “the ultimate success” of the constabulary “rests upon its non-partisan character.” This character would need to endure, because “when the American Marines shall have been withdrawn the responsibilities of Guardia will obviously be enormously increased (FRUS, 9 November 1929, Vol. III: 605). The State Department thus envisioned a professional Nicaraguan Guardia as an insurance policy against tumult when the U.S. could no longer oversee elections itself. As the Acting Secretary of State declared, “the continued maintenance of a Guardia Nacional... is important to the future peace and welfare of Nicaragua.” The Guardia’s “non-partisan principle, in particular, constitutes one of Nicaragua’s strongest guaranties of peace” (FRUS, 28 December 1933, Vol. V: 850-851).

While apolitical security forces would facilitate the U.S.’s democratization campaign in Nicaragua, they would also assist the military governments overseeing the Dominican Republic and Cuba. For instance, the U.S. sought an “apolitical military” in Santo Domingo that could ensure “constitutional government and stability” (Calder 2006: 61). Fellows explained how the U.S. sought to “build up a strong, well-trained, efficient and loyal National Constabulary which will be the loyal supporter of the President against his enemies, and which will be the lawful guardian of law and order in the Island” (Fellows 1923: 216). The military governor of Cuba, Major-General Leonard Wood, also emphasized how military reform could bring stability. “All that is wanted in Cuba to insure good order is an army of workmen. Give them work, free them from militarism, and, with a moderate but efficient police force, good order will prevail” (1899: 596). This “good order” depended on the right civil-military orientation, so Wood could only endorse the Rural Guard if Cuba’s national government “allowed [it] to be apolitical” (Millet

1972: 196). As Secretary Taft explained, the Rural Guard had to serve as “an agent of the Government and not of a political party” (quoted in Pérez 1976: 22).

“Depolitization,” a broad agenda that integrated the components of the Progressive Movement, thus informed the U.S.’s specific approach to FSF development. This approach manifested as three agency slack countermeasures. Through these countermeasures, the U.S. attempted to align FSF behavior with its foreign policy. They included 1) the codification of nonpartisanship, 2) American officer leadership, and 3) balancing political loyalties within FSF units.

Countermeasure 1: Codify Nonpartisanship

The first countermeasure publicly defined nonpartisanship as the cornerstone of civil-military reform in the Caribbean basin. Through official orders and treaties, as well as through new rules for recruitment, promotion, and termination, this countermeasure prohibited politicians from exploiting the constabularies and constables from engaging in politics. In the Dominican Republic, the military government “issued Executive Order No. 47,” which required “training the Guardia and...bringing it to a high state of efficiency” as a depoliticized national police force (quoted in Calder 2006: 54-55). This order reflected Governor Knapp’s strategy for constraining political activity. According to Knapp, the Guardia should operate as a “disciplined police force scattered over the republic in small units,” because such a force would be less “susceptible to control by a potential dictator” and incapable of “toppl[ing] the government” (ibid).

In Cuba, Governor Magoon ordered Rural Guard members to “refrain from political activity and, with few exceptions, manifest no desire to engage therein” (1907: 19-20).

Underscoring this order, he made “political activity a court-martial offense” (Millet 1972: 199).

To subordinate the military to civilian authority, moreover, he issued General Order 28 in 1907, which stated that:

Members of the Armed Forces will not discuss, either publicly or privately, their political opinions. They are soldiers of the state, and as such have no right to mix in politics. Their duty is to serve their government and take no part in its construction: their duty is to obey its orders... The welfare of the entire force depends on its being free from political combinations (quoted in Millet 1972: 199).

In Nicaragua, the Tipitapa Agreement of May 11, 1927, also known as the Stimson Agreement, mandated a “non-partisan national constabulary for Nicaragua which will have the duty of securing such a fair election and of preventing any fraud or intimidation of voters” (1927). In 1929, as signs of political corruption began to emerge, the Secretary of State instructed the U.S. minister in Nicaragua to remind President Moncada of that mandate. “[M]ake it clear that a non-partisan guardia is provided for in the Stimson Agreement and that any attempt to make the guardia a partisan organization is a direct violation of that agreement” (FRUS, 16 February 1929, Vol. III: 617). Hanna reinforced the Stimson Agreement with a new treaty “[p]roviding for the maintenance of the Non-Partisan Character of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua.” This treaty, which the leaders of Nicaragua’s Conservative and Liberal parties were required to sign, stated that the “non-partisan character of the Guardia Nacional shall be strictly maintained in the enlisted personnel, the cadets of the Military Academy, and in each grade of commissioned officers, except the grade of Jefe Director, and all vacancies shall be filled so as to maintain this non-partisan character” (FRUS, 5 November 1932. Vol. V: 887).

U.S. authorities thus attempted to enforce this character by depoliticizing procedures for recruitment, promotion, and termination. In Cuba, “[n]ew recruits were selected carefully” by the provisional government, which also “purged the Rural Guard of ‘objectionable’ men” (Pérez 1976: 23). Magoon decreed that promotion would “no longer [be] secured by political activity or

influence” (1907: 19-20). Rather, it would come through “merits, ability, and study” (Pérez 1976: 23).

Likewise, in Nicaragua, Hanna insisted that

Political considerations in conflict with the non-partisan character of the Guardia shall be wholly eliminated from all decisions affecting the promotion and dismissal of commissioned officers, cadets, and enlisted men, the selections to fill vacancies in the commissioned and enlisted strength, the discipline and command, and from all other decisions in connection with the administration of the Guardia (FRUS, 5 November 1932. Vol. V: 887).¹⁷

Marines screened recruits for signs of party loyalty. General Beadle explained that, “When a recruit joins the Guardia, he forswears under oath his interest in politics. He is held to this promise. When he openly violates it even in conversation he is discharged from the Guardia or otherwise severely punished” (quoted by Denny 1928). Before the Senate Foreign Relation Committee, General Lane further clarified the Guardia’s recruitment procedures. When Senator Swanson asked, “When they collect this native force, are they collected from any political combination or political body?” Lane replied, “No, sir; the principle is that the force is quite unpolitical, and the commandant has eliminated with great care anything that looks like political bias or anything indicating a disposition to draw recruits from any political party” (Senate 1928: 32). Finally, Dennig noted how the protocol for accepting cadets into the Nicaraguan Military Academy involved careful screening: Prospective cadets are “investigated by the nearest Guardia officer. The Guardia Headquarters then prepares a list of the desirable candidates and submits it to the President for his approval. The President examines this roster, paying particular attention to family connection and political affiliations” (1932: 76). These procedures followed from rules

¹⁷ Hanna described the rules of this agreement as not “the only measures necessary to preserve the non-political character of the Guardia, but merely as some of the essentials by way of setting forth the scope of the intent of the proposed agreement. I am of the opinion that the complete purpose we have in view may be better attained by making the agreement comprehensive but [sic] general in character rather than by endeavoring to specify therein the detailed procedure to be followed to preserve the non-political character of the Guardia in every possible situation which may arise” (FRUS, 5 November 1932. Vol. V: 885).

formalized in written agreements and orders, which established an explicit basis on which to police nonpartisanship and thus corral wayward security agents.

Countermeasure 2: Employ American Officers

The second agency slack countermeasure placed American officers in direct command of FSF units. These officers were to teach the value of obeying the rules outlined above and to enforce them when necessary. Beadle described this teaching process as Americans “impart[ing] to [the Guardia] their ideals and ideas of service” (quoted in Denny 1928). Those “ideals and ideas” complemented the official prohibitions on political involvement. Professionalizing FSF meant more than just banning them from politics; it also meant instilling within them the values that rejected politics and upheld constitutional order. As Munro recalled, “We thought that a disciplined force, trained by Americans, would do away with the petty local oppression” (quoted in Millet 2010: 3). As Matthews explained, the men of the Guardia “are trained” by their American overseers to

maintain an impartial attitude in regard to politics, and they are treated by their officers in a manner which stimulates their national patriotism. There has been hardly a case of disloyalty among the men, and *as long as they operate under American officers*, and with the organization based on the Guardia agreement, it is firmly believed that they could be counted upon to the last man to carry out any orders which might be necessary to uphold and maintain the constituted government” (FRUS, 16 November 1931, Vol. V: 855, emphasis added).

Policymakers emphasized American officer oversight even when it conflicted with plans to relinquish authority to the Nicaraguan government. How could the Guardia, an ostensible Nicaraguan organization, conform to an American design? Stimson negotiated that question by “making the Guardia Nacional subject of course to the command of the President of Nicaragua” while also giving the “Chief of the Guardia [an American Marine] a sufficient measure of control

over such matters as recruiting, internal organization and discipline.” This would “enable him to maintain the strict non-partisanship which under the terms of the Tipitapa Agreement must be its essential characteristic” (FRUS, 29 May 1929, Vol. III: 630). In a letter to the Chargé, Stimson put it bluntly, declaring that the “non-partisanship of the new force cannot otherwise be maintained” without American officer oversight (FRUS, 29 May 1929, Vol. III: 631). Admiral Latimer, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was equally blunt in responding to a question about the durability of the Nicaraguan government. Latimer explained that yes, the government could endure “until another election.” He hastened to add, however, that “there must be a constabulary and it must be officered, certainly for quite a while, by American officers” (Senate 1928: 33).

U.S. authorities in the Dominican Republic and Cuba also emphasized the role of American officer leadership. For example, the U.S. Military Governor in the Dominican Republic, Harry Knapp, detailed how a new constabulary would usher in political reform if it were “indoctrinated properly, and especially if it [were] given the example of the United States Marines serving alongside of it for a considerable period” (FRUS, 21 July 1917: 711). Key to that indoctrination was the “officer appointed to command the Guardia Nacional Dominicana.” He “shall be a citizen of the United States,” tasked with bringing the Guardia to a “high state of efficiency” (Williams 1918: 196). When Hanna described the “necessity of increasing the efficiency of the Cuban Army” in 1904, he recommended that as “a temporary expedient the Rural Guard should have an instructor detailed from the United States Cavalry; this is most necessary until such time as there may be competent Cuban officers to replace him” (1904: 35). Once the U.S. re-intervened in Cuba in 1906, it put this recommendation into practice. The Provisional Government directed “U.S. Army officers,” many with experience training the

Philippines Scouts and Constabulary, to “inculcate professionalism and improve [the Rural Guard’s] military proficiency” (Millet 1972: 199). Magoon celebrated these American officers, noting that they “are performing excellent service. All of them entered upon the discharge of their duties with enthusiasm and confidence of speedy success” (1907: 19).

While the U.S. had confidence that its own officers could expunge partisanship from the constabularies and render them efficient, it had little confidence that “native officers” could do the same. As I mentioned above, this doubt reinforced itself. Distrustful of native officers, the U.S. neglected to train them, especially at the higher ranks, but this neglect only increased worries that they would abuse their authority after they filled the positions vacated by American officers. As Stimson explained, the “basis of a really orderly turnover that would not immediately break down would seem to lie not merely in the transfer of positions to Nicaraguan officers but in the ability of these officers to handle capably and efficiently their new duties when once assumed” (FRUS, 19 July 1932, Vol. V: 866).

As they prepared to withdraw, U.S. officials recognized the indispensability of American officers to FSF development. For instance, Hanna noted that while the Guardia “has given an excellent account of itself under American direction,” it was “untried under Nicaraguan leadership” (FRUS, 4 November 1932, Vol. V: 877). To prepare that leadership, Stimson insisted that Nicaraguans “serve an apprenticeship” under American officers before taking command (FRUS, 19 July 1932, Vol. V: 866). But Hanna suggested that many Nicaraguans would probably become military officers without military training and thus circumvent the influence of American officers. Because “no American-trained Nicaraguan officer has been advanced to a grade higher than first lieutenant,” the withdrawal of American officers would compel the Nicaraguan government to fill the vacancies with “persons taken from civil life, none of whom

probably will have the specialized training which the younger officers have received under American officers” (FRUS, 4 November 1932, Vol. V: 877). Hanna warned that transferring control to Nicaraguans who lacked American indoctrination would tarnish the “high standard of efficiency maintained in the Guardia under American officers” (FRUS, 19 July 1932, Vol. V: 866). This loss of efficiency could then jeopardize U.S.-Nicaragua relations: “The fact that the Nicaraguan Guardia Nacional has been commanded by American officers has had a powerful restraining influence on the Nicaraguan Government. The possibility of an open break between the two countries will be vastly increased after the Guardia is turned over to Nicaraguan control” (FRUS, 16 August 1932, Vol. V: 937).

By the early 1930s, the U.S. had finalized plans to withdraw from the Caribbean basin. But the personnel responsible for FSF development knew that once the U.S. withdrew, it surrendered direct oversight over the constabularies and thus lost the “restraining influence” of American officers.¹⁸ They feared that without that influence, the constabularies would fall victim to under-trained officers, corrupt politicians, and the temptation to exercise independent political power. Those most involved in preparing the constabularies feared that they remained unwilling or incapable of abiding by the civil-military arrangement that the U.S. had prescribed. It became clear that these FSF, on their own, could easily become unreliable and counterproductive as security proxies.

Countermeasure 3: Balance Political Affiliations

In the waning moments of the intervention in Nicaragua, U.S. officials realized that seemingly immutable party loyalties threatened to derail their de-politicizing agenda. And so, in

¹⁸ Calder mentions that in response to this concern, the U.S. planned to leave beyond over 200 Marines in the Dominican Republic “serving not only as instructors but as protection against possible revolutions” (2006: 59).

a desperate effort to secure the Guardia's nonpartisanship, U.S. officials put their hopes in bipartisanship. That is, they filled the Nicaraguan officer corps with equal parts Conservative and Liberal. Hanna first suggested this strategy in 1932 when describing the "best that can be hoped for" in recruiting native officers. He noted that the U.S. should first try to find officers with "limited political bias." Failing that, it would be "helpful if these officers could be selected in equal numbers from the two political parties" (FRUS, 1932, 19 July 1932, Vol. V: 865-866). Hanna became more emphatic on this point, arguing that the "continuance of the Guardia Nacional on a non-partisan basis makes it imperative that the officers in each grade (excepting the grade of Jefe Director) shall be equally divided between members of the two historic political parties and that the equal division be maintained" (FRUS, 3 November 1932, Vol. V: 885).

Hanna's plan found support in the State Department. Stimson explained that Matthews should constitute the Nicaraguan officer corps by "divid[ing] his selections as nearly as possible both as to the number and rank between Liberals and Conservatives" (FRUS, 19 July 1932, Vol. V: 866). The Acting Secretary of State concurred, telling Hanna that the plan to transfer control looked "satisfactory from both the military and political standpoint." He felt confident that such a plan "will assure continuance of the non-partisan basis of the Guardia since its officers will be drawn equally from the two historic political parties" (FRUS, 30 August 1932, Vol. V: 872). At the behest of the State Department, Matthews then communicated to the Nicaraguans the "plan hereinafter set forth for the selection of Nicaraguan officers who will replace the American officers serving in the Guardia Nacional." He declared that

each one of the Presidential candidates of the two Historic Parties of Nicaragua will be asked to present immediately a list containing the names of persons acceptable to said candidate from among whom the Nicaraguan officers who are going to replace the American officers at present serving in the Guardia may be chosen. The list which each candidate will present in this manner should contain the names of members of both political Parties in equal parts (half and half) (FRUS, 20 October 1932, Vol. V: 875).

Concluding the U.S.'s formal involvement with the Guardia, Stimson congratulated the Liberals and Conservatives for cooperating with this bipartisan arrangement. "The direction of the Guardia has now passed from American to Nicaraguan officers," he remarked, "and it is noteworthy that both political parties have agreed on their own initiative to a plan for insuring the non-political character of that organization" (FRUS, 28 December 1932, Vol. V: 924). Stimson's confident tone notwithstanding, that "plan" grew from desperation. Without American officers to monitor a force that seemed unable to maintain its professionalism, the State Department gambled on a bipartisan Nicaraguan officer corps. It bet that a Guardia equally Liberal and Conservative would eventually become neither. As I discuss in the next section, that was a bet that the U.S. eventually lost.

These three agency slack countermeasures aimed to create professional security forces in countries where such forces had never existed. From the perspective of U.S. officials, this dramatic reform effort was necessary to break the cycle of political and economic instability. Depoliticizing these forces would maximize their efficiency and enable them to calm the disorder that their unprofessional predecessors had inflamed. In the end, it would make them well-behaved agents. At least that was the idea. As Keyser put it at the time, whether this reform in civil-military relations "proves to be the panacea for all their troubles, that many predict, only time can supply the answer" (1926: 88).

The Unintended Consequences of FSF Development

These de-politicizing efforts in the Caribbean and Central America reflected a fixation on nonpartisan efficiency. This fixation did not grow de novo out of the U.S. experience abroad, but came instead from Progressive Era reforms popular at home. There is, however, an irony to this

particular projection and application of “machine-age culture.” The U.S. imposed a pre-given model “accurate on paper” within settings that ultimately rejected it. The single-minded commitment to this model made the U.S. unable “at the beginning of the [20th] century to cope with revolution in the world at the same time it was searching for efficiency at home” (Israel 1972: 196). As Israel notes, “the priorities of that period might have created the mismanagement most feared” (ibid).

The Progressive Movement identified a positive correlation between efficiency and nonpartisanship; U.S. FSF development in the Caribbean inverted that correlation. The U.S. failed to make its security proxies nonpartisan, in large part because it succeeded in making them more efficient. By disarming the population, emasculating the *caudillos*, and weakening insurgencies, the U.S. and the constabularies had fortified the central governments (Gobat 2005: 206). That fortification, however, came at a price: well-trained, well-armed, and well-organized security forces that, thanks to their U.S. training and arms, monopolized the use of organized violence after the U.S. left. Moreover, the training that these forces had received from American Marines and soldiers turned them into militarized police, primed to confront “banditry” as an existential threat to the state (Millet 2010: 3).¹⁹ Once the U.S. withdrew, the constabularies mutated into instruments that opportunistic officers could exploit. Without armed rivals or direct U.S. oversight, Anastasio Somoza in Nicaragua, Rafael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, and Fulgencio Batista in Cuba—all onetime members of U.S.-sponsored security forces—could

¹⁹ Much has been written about the perniciousness of mixing military and police functions, especially in Latin America, but Admiral William Adama (from the television program *Battlestar Galactica*) put it best: “There’s a reason we separate military and the police: one fights the enemy of the state, the other serves and protects the people. When the military becomes both, then the enemies of the state tend to become the people” (quoted in Carpenter et al. 2011: 19).

usurp control over the state's armed forces, quash their opposition, and rule indefinitely.²⁰ Instead of proscribing partisanship, therefore, technical efficiency facilitated it.

The rise of these dictatorships highlights the unintended consequences of FSF development. The "policies of the United States backfired," explains Lieuwen. These policies, "because they unified and made efficient armed bodies hitherto poorly organized and equipped, inadvertently helped to insure the political domination of the military" (1961: 186-187). Many historians of U.S.-Latin American relations share this view. Calder points to the Guardia Nacional Dominicana as an "excellent illustration of the unplanned and unpredictable nature of the occupation's legacy" (2006: 239). While the U.S. had endeavored to create an "apolitical military," capable of "maintaining constitutional government and stability," it produced something else entirely (2006: 61). Similarly, Gobat argues that the U.S. wanted the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua to serve as the "main guarantor of the democratization process" (2005: 205). That process, he explains, "revolutionized Nicaraguan state-society relations but not in the ways envisioned by U.S. policymakers." Instead, it "paved the way for authoritarian rule" (206). Finally, Richard Millet takes special aim at the U.S.'s attempt at neutralizing partisanship via bipartisan officer recruitment. Such a policy, he argues, "ensured that the Guardia's top ranks would be filled with men of definite political loyalties." This "once again placed control of Nicaragua's armed forces in partisan, political hands" (1977: 130). These unintended consequences reflect the hazards of agency costs and the difficulties of imposing civil-military

²⁰ Allan R. Millet points out an important contrast, however. Unlike the constabularies in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, the Cuban Rural Guard "did not become the dominant military power base for uniformed politicians. Instead it was itself subverted by both Cubans and Americans until it lost the institutional stability and professional autonomy which would have made it politically powerful" (1972: 191). Batista, a member of the Cuban Army who rose to power in the early 1930s, would have only been indirectly associated with the Rural Guard, though Pérez does describe him as one of the "products of [U.S.-created] military establishments" (1982: 185). As Lieuwen argues, the "long history of militarism" in Batista's Cuba "cannot be laid at the door of the United States and its military occupation many years before. But it is obvious that the intervention did nothing to save Cuba from the curse of irresponsible rule" (1961: 179).

reforms by fiat. Moreover, they reveal that by empowering some domestic actors over others, FSF development is inherently political, even when its explicit aim is creating apolitical FSF (Sereseres 1979: 332).

An alternative view suggests that installing dictatorships within the Caribbean basin had been the U.S.'s plan all along. This view holds that because these dictatorships ultimately suited U.S. foreign policy, especially during the Cold War, then installing them must have been the original motivation behind developing local security forces. In other words, because the re-politicization of security agents happened, the U.S. must have wanted it to happen as a way of exerting future control. This functionalism challenges constructivist principal-agent theory by discounting the effect of Progressive Era discourse on both the definition of the FSF agency problem and the efforts to mitigate it. In this alternative account, the long-term exigencies of "objective" U.S. security interests trivialized any commitment to apolitical efficiency in FSF development.

While a number of authors share this perspective of U.S. FSF in general (as I show throughout this dissertation), the historian Louis Pérez advances it in relation to the empirical settings described in this chapter. He argues that the Caribbean constabularies represented the "product of American policy requirements." As "gendarmes of empire," they were "politically sensitive to U.S. policy needs." They "provided Washington a powerful institution through which to manipulate political developments in a manner consistent with American needs" (1982: 185). To support the inference that U.S. officials had fashioned perfectly reliable agents, Pérez notes that "local custody over the client states passed under the control of men who were themselves products of these establishments—Somoza in Nicaragua, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, and Batista in Cuba" (ibid). For Pérez, the fact that dictators came to power via their

participation in U.S. FSF development represents the culmination of a preexisting plan. In this account, the masters of American foreign policy demonstrate remarkable foresight; their ability to manipulate people and institutions to their liking effectively eliminates agency costs.

This chapter reveals, however, that the masters of American foreign policy lacked foresight, produced an outcome at odds with their original plan, and mismanaged agency costs. In other words, the rise of dictatorships via FSF development was an accident—a serendipitous one during the Cold War for sure, as it created anti-communist allies, but still an accident.

Pérez’s argument is in tension with other historical accounts, even those he cites approvingly. For example, Pérez cites Goldwert (1962), yet Goldwert argues that the “course of history” in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua “was altered by the constabularies *in a way which hardly conformed to United States aspirations*” (vii, emphasis added). As Goldwert points out, the U.S. Chargé in Nicaragua conceded at the time that the “policy was a failure,” not a success (ibid: 49). Pérez also cites Richard Millet’s history of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua, but Millet’s account suggests that the U.S. pushed nonpartisanship for as long as it could.²¹ When U.S. Marines and State Department personnel became increasingly aware of the Guardia’s political activity, their reactions were not of approval, but of resignation. Millet comes closest to supporting Pérez when he describes U.S. “acquiescence” to growing partisanship in the Guardia. But this “acquiescence” only occurred at the end of the occupation, when U.S. officials realized that their depoliticizing agenda had run out of time. Millet never questions that the “Guardia had been envisioned [by the U.S.] as an instrument for ending the tradition of using the

²¹ In later work, Millet explains that it was “domestic political forces” that opposed apolitical constabularies. “There was rarely any genuine interest in the creation of a professional, nonpartisan force that would not serve largely the interests of whatever faction was in power... Central governments also saw such forces as a means of breaking the power of regional strongmen” (2010: 4). Calder makes a similar claim when explaining the politicization of the Guardia Dominicana: “Traditional Dominican political culture rather than poorly conceived (and, for six years, poorly executed) hopes of the occupiers shaped the Guardia” (2006: 62).

military for partisan political purposes” (1977: 139). Finally, Pérez cites Sereseres, but his review of Millet draws lessons from the constabulary experience inconsistent with a functionalist argument. In reference to the rise of dictatorships, Sereseres argues that, “security assistance programs must take into account the *unintended political consequences*, including undesirable involvement in local political conflicts and unwanted identification with particular types of regimes” (1979: 332, emphasis added). Pérez’s account glosses over those unintended consequences.

Pérez also draws from his own research on U.S. intervention in Cuba, but even this fails to establish U.S. plans to re-politicize its Caribbean security proxies. Pérez acknowledges that when American officials debated the relative merits of forming a Cuban army or constabulary (the Rural Guard), they worried about the threat of “politics creeping in.” He notes that, “American advisors to the Rural Guard unanimously opposed the army project,” citing the “professional limitations” of a Cuban army likely to become “a machine of [the Liberal party’s] makings and workings” (1972: 268). Pérez quotes an American officer who asked, “Is the future of Cuba...to be trusted to an army created by the direction of one political party”? (268) In his book on the same subject, Pérez explains how the U.S. had already taken steps to protect the Rural Guard from such political involvement: “American military advisors designed reforms to raise the professional quality of the Cuban force [i.e., the Rural Guard]. Governor Magoon labored to remove politics from the armed organization, banning all partisan activity...The provisional government pledged that promotions would not be secured by political activity or influence” (1976: 23). What then accounts for the eventual politicization of the Cuban security force? Allan R. Millet suggests that it resulted from a lack of U.S. influence, not, as Pérez would argue, a surfeit of it. As Millet explains, the “Cubanization” of the Rural Guard “unwittingly

assisted the Cuban *politicos* destroy what had been the nation's most effective and stable peace-keeping agency" (1972: 205).²²

So these FSF were not, as Pérez asserts, "imbued with American values" (1982: 185). If we accept that one of those values was nonpartisan efficiency—as the evidence indicates—then security forces in the Caribbean clearly rejected it. Describing the Guardia Dominicana, Calder explains how "officials of the military government merely established an institution based on a U.S. model; they could not impose the values which lay at the core of that model" (2006: 62). And the U.S. "programs doomed to failure were those which...depended on the transplanting of U.S. values to make them function successfully" (2006: 243). Describing the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua, Millet notes that "while technical expertise can be created, altering political behavior and institutions are much more difficult, if not impossible" (2010: 117).

If we evaluate FSF development in the Caribbean by the standards originally set by U.S. officials, then we have to deem it a failure. These officials realized as much when they saw growing partisanship within the FSF ranks. In the end, they witnessed the limited efficacy of their agency slack countermeasures. By highlighting the anxiety over partisanship within the Caribbean constabularies, constructivist principal-agent theory does a better job than the functionalist perspective in accounting for the possibility that FSF development would yield undesired outcomes. After all, the possibility of those outcomes—i.e., the threat of agency slack—drives the principal-agent problem and reminds the principal that agents may not always act according to plan.

²² While Millet acknowledges that the Guard's American advisor facilitated its slide towards partisanship, he argues that the "'Cubanization' of the Rural Guard... was primarily the responsibility of President Gomez and General Montegudo, both of whom had no intention of allowing Cuba's most effective soldiery to be neutral in national politics" (1972: 211)

While the countermeasures may have had limited efficacy, they still structured the U.S.'s approach to developing FSF in the Caribbean basin. That they failed does not mean that American officials never prioritized them, implemented them, or tried to make them work. The evidence from primary and secondary sources presented in this chapter is clear on this point: U.S. officials fixated on inculcating nonpartisanship because they treated partisanship as the primary source of FSF unreliability. Instead of betraying the machinations of perfectly reliable security proxies, therefore, the rise of dictatorships indicated a principal's fleeting control over its agents.

Policymakers take heed. Do not let your eagerness to outsource security responsibilities blind you to the possibility that agents could defy whatever countermeasures you implement. Your calculation and payment of agency costs does not always yield the desired results.

Conclusion

Just because the U.S. never intended to incubate partisan security forces in Central America and the Caribbean does not absolve it of moral responsibility for doing so. Intended or not, the consequences of U.S. FSF development saddled Nicaraguans, Dominicans, and Cubans with brutal regimes. And it is important to acknowledge that the U.S. later exploited these security forces, and others like them, during the Cold War (the topic of the next chapter).

But we should not let hindsight refracted through the Cold War prism skew our perspective. FSF development in the Caribbean basin during the early 20th century sought order and friendly regimes, of course, but not through partisan security forces and the imposition of dictatorships. Instead, the U.S. sought those objectives through nonpartisan security forces and constitutional governments. This was because, as constructivist principal-agent theory shows,

U.S. officials drew from Progressive Era discourse and framed FSF partisanship itself as the problem—specifically, as the social basis of the agency problem. The U.S. thus understood FSF partisanship as the barrier, or, agency cost, that would need to be overcome to effect agents whose behavior advanced, rather than hindered, U.S. interests. And so, the U.S. devised three strategies—codification of nonpartisanship, American officer oversight, and bipartisanship—to neutralize political attachment. Professionalized FSF offered U.S. officials overseeing Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua the promise of organizational efficiency, which they (wrongly) associated with political and economic stability, even republican government and democracy. Sadly, U.S. misjudgment and hubris left little chance that these local forces would ultimately fulfill that promise.

In the next chapter, I investigate U.S. FSF development at the beginning of the Cold War, when a third controversy over how best to control FSF elicited responses from U.S. officials far different from the ones described in this chapter. Explaining that variation is the task to which I now turn.

Chapter 5:

Developing FSF in the ‘Developing World’: The U.S. Confronts the Cold War FSF Problem, 1945-1975

Introduction

How could the United States outsource security responsibilities to foreign armed forces that also served their own sovereign states—states whose interests might not align with those of the U.S.? In this chapter, I examine how U.S. policymakers evaluated and confronted the problem of integrating FSF into its Cold War grand strategy. The U.S. could no longer align these forces with its strategic objectives via overt imperialism, as it had done during the early 20th century in the Philippines and Caribbean basin. In this post-Atlantic Charter era of decolonization and self-determination, every state, no matter how young or how underdeveloped, enjoyed the benefits of de jure sovereignty, not the least of which was dominion over its own coercive apparatus. Gone were the days when the U.S. could bypass local political authority by raising FSF units from scratch and commanding them with American officers. At the same time, the U.S. still sought to enlist Third World FSF as extensions of its own military. The global scale of the Cold War required that the U.S. delegate to those forces the job of stemming communism in their own countries. The American military could not be everywhere at once. Foreign militaries would need to “man the ramparts” and hold off communist threats wherever they might appear.

Such a strategy was organized through hierarchy, with the U.S. at the top, but had to contend with an international system built around equality, with developing states now claiming the same rights to sovereignty that the developed world had heretofore monopolized.

Nationalism within the Third World—particularly within the militaries receiving American arms and training—thus threatened to disrupt American Cold War leadership. That leadership was further threatened by socioeconomic underdevelopment itself, which had made communism an attractive option for local politicians. In this way, international development became strategically significant. Any state that aligned with the USSR and its particular brand of rapid modernization deprived the U.S. of prospective military proxies and bolstered the Kremlin’s own network of military power. Ultimately, Third World FSF represented flawed agents because their nationalism challenged American influence while their underdevelopment opened them to non-American influence. In defining the social basis of the FSF agency problem, therefore, policymakers highlighted how FSF operated in a fraught environment that combined sovereignty with socioeconomic backwardness. Such an environment threatened American control.

To cover the agency costs of entrusting arms and training to foreign armed forces, the U.S designed and deployed four agency slack countermeasures. These countermeasures mediated between building a “transnational organization of military power” and respecting an international community that enshrined the sovereignty of its member states. They included 1) monitoring the use of military assistance, 2) delimiting the training and equipment provided, 3) bribing FSF and their political leaders to behave in the desired ways, and 4) socializing FSF to become pro-American.

The fourth countermeasure reflected the particular conception of Third World militaries within modernization theory, an ideology that in the 1950s and 1960s had become the zeitgeist within the American foreign policy establishment (Gilman 2003). By characterizing Third World militaries, particularly their officers, as prospective allies, modernization theory proposed a novel notion: that they could be easily socialized into embracing and then advancing U.S. interests.

Socialization offered a particularly effective and efficient countermeasure. Through indoctrination, whether abroad or in the U.S., it promised to attach foreign security proxies to their American mentors in ways that would mitigate, if not dissolve altogether, the FSF agency problem. So enamored was modernization theory with foreign officers that it championed them as *political* actors, as only they could match the discipline of communist parties and prevent the rise of communist leaders. Whereas the U.S. once feared the political activity of foreign security proxies and treated it as an agency cost to cover, as the previous chapter illustrated, it now endorsed that activity as a means of covering other agency costs—such as the steep cost of outsourcing security duties to militaries serving anti-American governments.

Modernization theory and its treatment of foreign military officers also enabled policymakers to fold economic assistance into military assistance. This allowed the U.S. to target socioeconomic underdevelopment while also bolstering its contacts with Third World militaries. Given their expansive role in developing societies, foreign officers represented engines of economic progress as well as military assets. By tasking these officers with “civic action programs” and exposing them to civilian skills training, the U.S. sought to merge economic and military assistance within its broad agenda for international development. Importantly, this merging countered mounting criticism that U.S. foreign aid had become too “militaristic” and unsuited for the problem of economic stagnation in the Third World. By characterizing foreign militaries, especially their officers, as the vanguard of socioeconomic progress, U.S. policymakers could justify military aid on economic grounds and further solidify an international network of military power.

To investigate how the U.S. defined and responded to the Cold War FSF agency problem, I analyze foreign policy discourse from the late 1950s through the early 1970s. While this

discourse includes various contributions from government and academia, its dominant text comes from President Eisenhower's Committee to Study the United States Military Assistance Program, which produced a final public report, plus many internal reports, meeting minutes, and memoranda. Formed in 1959, this committee became known as the "Draper Committee," named for its chairman, William Draper, a onetime military officer, undersecretary of the Army, diplomat, and banker. Eisenhower mandated that the committee "undertake a completely independent, objective, and nonpartisan analysis of the military assistance aspects of the Mutual Security Program (MSP)," a program that offered military and economic assistance to bolster a global anti-Soviet alliance. That this analysis ultimately agreed with the Eisenhower Administration's pro military assistance stance is less important than *how* the committee legitimized that stance. In his summary of the Draper report, Henry Bienen explained that it "made a positive assessment of the capacities of military in non-Western countries to carry out nation-building programs. Armies existed, they would not go away, and they often were the only institution available to make headway in economic and social development programs" (1971: 9).

In the sections that follow I first examine how policymakers conceived of the problem of integrating FSF from underdeveloped but sovereign states into U.S. grand strategy. Next, I show how this conception shaped the kinds of military assistance programs that the U.S. would put into practice. Then I discuss modernization theory and its treatment of foreign militaries, specifically, its emphasis on socialization as a means of turning foreign soldiers into willing instruments of American foreign policy. Finally, I show how integrating economic and military assistance allowed the U.S. to address socioeconomic underdevelopment in Third World states by targeting their militaries.

FSF Alterity in the Early Cold War

To make sense of the U.S.'s relationship with foreign security forces during the Cold War, it is first important to specify the salient marker of difference within FSF discourse. During the previous period, that marker manifested as racial inferiority and partisanship. The U.S. emphasized these characteristics as the problems that it would have to mitigate if it was to turn foreign troops into reliable instruments of its foreign policy. Skeptics during that period found such problems daunting. They balked at integrating “racially inferior” or “partisan” troops into U.S. military operations in the Philippines, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. Fears over disloyalty, duplicity, and incompetence had rendered security outsourcing a “dubious experiment.” For FSF proponents, however, the racial and partisan problems had a common solution—direct American oversight, provided by American military officers, who could train FSF units and lead them in the field. For these proponents, foreign troops were still racially inferior or woefully partisan, but they could at least be trained to conform with American interests with the right supervision.

At the beginning of the Cold War, calculations of the agency costs incurred by security outsourcing no longer considered racial inferiority or partisanship.²³ Rather, U.S. officials worried about the “quasi-statehood” of new and developing states and about the problems of sovereignty in the hands of politically immature, economically backward people (Jackson 1990). “Many underdeveloped countries,” explained one Draper Committee study, “are hardly nations

²³ This change in discourse on foreign soldiers was itself part of a broader “retreat of scientific racism” within the United States that began in the 1930s (Barkan 1992). See also Furedi (1998) and Latham (2011: 21). A different discourse, did not, however, minimize hierarchy between the U.S. self and the FSF other. As D. Michael Shafer explains, modernization theory “sanctioned the power asymmetries between modern and traditional societies and provided a socially acceptable new vocabulary for familiar racist characterizations of the ‘inferior races’ ”(1988: 65).

in any real sense” (F2807).²⁴ This hierarchy of state-ness, so central to modernization theory, raised questions about how a developed country like the U.S. could outsource security responsibilities to those from developing countries. Could the U.S. integrate FSF into its global security strategy? Were FSF susceptible to communist infiltration? Was the “human material” constituting FSF capable of standing up to communist aggression? Could FSF learn how to use modern military equipment? (F2470) Would military assistance exacerbate, rather than ease, domestic unrest within recipient states? What if developing FSF served to strengthen unfriendly regimes?

These questions reflected the pessimistic counterpoint to the optimistic teleology normally associated with modernization theory. While this theory held “assumptions about the universal validity of U.S. institutions and the malleability of foreign societies,” it also held “long-standing reservations about the nature of foreign peoples” and recognized the “need for their transformation to be carefully channeled and controlled.” As Michael Latham goes on to explain, modernization “promised a more productive, more just, and more democratic international order. But it did so in ways that reflected a persistent ambivalence about the people and societies that were to be transformed” (2011: 12; 61).

These people and their societies posed an acute challenge for U.S. security outsourcing because they were both underdeveloped *and* protected from outside intervention by juridical claims to political independence. Such independence meant that local actors were free to resist U.S. prescriptions and to embrace its strategic rival. In a *World Politics* article from 1959, Guy Pauker asked, “Can nationalism and the growing demand for economic development be

²⁴ As in other chapters, I cite these archival documents using their unique alphanumeric code. The companion website housing those documents can be found at: http://www.flickr.com/photos/rittinger_archive-research/collections/72157627559408995/

prevented from entering into an alliance with communism” (1959: 338)? As Latham notes, U.S. officials feared that “reject[ing] wholesale the aspirations of Indians, Indonesians, Vietnamese, Egyptians, Iranians, Algerians, Kenyans, and Gold Coasters... would embitter nationalists and cede the field to Soviet intervention” (2011: 29). In the past, the U.S. responded to unrest, insurgencies, and underdevelopment in foreign countries by occupying them, putting American officials in charge of their governments, and replacing their armed forces with American-led constabularies (Latham 2011: 18). Indeed, from the perspective of U.S. officials, when a country fell into political or economic unrest, it nullified its right to autonomy and signaled the need for “responsible” states to put its domestic affairs back in order. But now, such blatant intervention would violate the U.S.’s official endorsement of national self-determination. In this age of decolonization, American strategists had little choice but to engage with existing armed forces, which served governments jealous of their sovereign rights. Such forces could easily escape the reach of U.S. authority and stray from its strategic objectives.

U.S. foreign policy discourse certainly recognized that foreign militaries were not simply appendages of the American military and that they were in fact foreign soldiers in the service of their own governments. One Draper Committee Report noted, for example, the inherent conflict between U.S. FSF goals and those of the recipient countries. The U.S., it explained,

has much greater control over the development of its own forces than over allied forces... After the foreign force objectives are determined, *there remains the knotty problem of eliciting the cooperation of the various foreign nations*. These nations have their own ideas about their requirements and capabilities... and often choose to maintain considerably less or considerably more military force than the United States thinks best (F3128, emphasis added; see also F1282; F1563).

As late as 1971, Congress acknowledged the constraints on U.S. plans for FSF development: “So long as nations remain sovereign, the United States can never be certain that, regardless of the amounts of money, equipment or training given, a recipient nation’s armed forces can be counted

upon to assist us in a crisis. MAP [Military Assistance Program] troops will always remain foreign troops and their use ultimately a matter [of] policy [for] their own governments” (1971: 17-18; see also F1786). The Committee further expressed anxiety over the ambitiousness of FSF development: “the assistance program required to prepare the military for the task of achieving political stabilization, social reconstruction and economic development, will be so all-inclusive that it may easily impinge upon professional pride and national sensitivities” (F2590). The “presence of American or other Western advisors in recipient countries” should therefore “be minimized as much as possible” (ibid). In Cold War FSF discourse—amid calls for coups against unfriendly regimes and a tendency to treat foreign troops as auxiliaries in the U.S.’s own military—Third World sovereignty was unavoidable. It informed how policymakers calculated the agency costs of delegating security responsibilities to foreign militaries.

Policymakers on the Draper Committee recognized that they needed to cover those costs if they wanted foreign troops to act as reliable agents. Specifically, they acknowledged that nationalism among foreign security forces and their respective governments would lead them to prize their sovereignty, not surrender it to a foreign power like the U.S. As Eisenhower put it, the U.S. would thus have to “utilize this spirit of nationalism in its own interest” (quoted in Latham 2011: 41).²⁵ This required the Draper Committee to reframe military assistance as compatible with, if not conducive to, Third World sovereignty. “Military capability,” the Committee explained, “is a recognized attribute of sovereignty, which is particularly desirable to a country which is newly in possession of sovereignty” (F3209). FSF development could conceivably help governments consolidate control within their borders and defend themselves against external

²⁵ Latham further explains how Kennedy continued this approach: “Convinced that the decolonizing world represented a crucial battlefield in the global Cold War, Kennedy and his advisors fully expected that planning, development, and foreign assistance could become key elements in a broad strategy designed to steer nationalist forces toward liberal capitalism” (2011: 57).

threats. Developing states needed military assistance, the Committee argued, “to provide their people with a sense of security and to foster confidence in the nation’s future and sovereign status. This is in pursuance of the traditional attributes, responsibilities, and rights of a sovereign to raise and maintain military forces for self-defense” (F1612). In another report, the Committee described how military aid could “restore stable political institutions” (F2822). A third report looked to military aid as an instrument of “maintaining internal security and prestige of governments or factions, and thereby protecting national independence” (F3013). Through FSF development, therefore, the U.S. could bolster the sovereignty of developing states, both symbolically and substantively.

FSF discourse also highlighted Third World sovereignty to distinguish the U.S. from former colonial powers and from the Soviet Union. While the USSR propped up puppet governments within its sphere of influence, the U.S. would respect the authority and independence of the governments whose militaries it trained and equipped. Uncomfortable with the imperialist label, “Eisenhower and his advisors” sought “to separate the United States from imperialism and present a far more appealing vision” (Latham 2011: 41). One Draper Committee report lamented that “Asians” confuse current American FSF development programs with past imperialism and thus fail to appreciate the U.S.’s true anti-imperial identity:

To even hope that they would account us different [from past European colonizers], remember us as the people of the American Revolution, to have confidence that we would be motivated by generosity, magnanimity with a complete absence of a desire to dominate them as had other western nations was to expect the impossible... Years of patient endeavor backed by a sound consistent policy will be needed to convince Asians that the United States firmly believes in and will support a national policy that will assist them in their struggle for betterment and a somewhat equal status (F1918; see also F2266).

To distinguish the U.S. from its Cold War adversary, some Draper Committee documents even suggested entrusting MAP recipients with nuclear weapons. Such a move would

demonstrate considerable trust in host governments and confidence in the FSF that served them. As the committee explained, sharing nuclear technology would “exemplify the mutual confidence which links the Free World alliance system. The Kremlin, by contrast, is unwilling to place such weapons at the disposal of its ‘trusted’ confederates” (F1958). Within this FSF discourse, therefore, the U.S. condemned the imperial hierarchy of the USSR and championed an egalitarian “alliance system.” Such a system would ostensibly allow the U.S. to lead a multinational military force without the trappings of empire.

There is no denying, however, that FSF discourse dwelled on aligning nationalist foreign security forces with U.S. strategic objectives. After all, the U.S. armed and trained FSF to make them serve its foreign policy interests, not necessarily the interests of their respective national governments (F2868). In fact, as I discuss below, the U.S. often pitted FSF officers against their own governments. A number of U.S. policymakers even treated FSF as if they were in fact U.S. military personnel who happened to be wearing different uniforms (F1493; F2379; F2470; F2490).

Ultimately, the U.S. sought control over forces that it had no juridical right to control. The exigencies of the Cold War prevented the U.S. from retreating into isolationism, but they also presented tactical challenges to building a network of military power that would advance its grand strategy. W.W. Rostow, one of the “action intellectuals” of modernization theory, articulated this dilemma—between empire and “fortress America”—that the U.S. faced:

The United States has no interest in political satellites. Where we have military pacts we have them because governments feel directly endangered by outside military action and we are prepared to help protect their independence against such military action. But, to use Mao Tse-tung’s famous phrase, *we do not seek nations which ‘lean to one side.’ We seek nations which shall stand up straight* (1961: 235, emphasis added).

FSF discourse certainly acknowledged foreign sovereignty, but mostly because it posed an obstacle to exerting influence over local security forces. What if a developing country opted not to “stand up straight”? What if it failed to engage in what the Draper Committee cryptically referred to as “responsible international behavior”? (F1398) What if, more specifically, FSF took U.S. assistance but failed to follow U.S. guidelines? Barkawi and Laffey are correct to identify a “transnational constitution of force,” but they understate just how contested and loosely constituted it appeared to American Cold War strategists.

There is no circumventing the drive for control permeating Cold War FSF discourse. But it is difficult to ignore how that discourse also opposed imperial rule. Some scholars resolve this contradiction by letting the drive for control override the opposition to empire. From this view, anti-imperialism was public relations; training and arming foreign troops was a means of imperial control and it worked. The problem with this approach, however, is that it gives the impression that American strategists conceived of foreign soldiers as pawns, easily manipulated by their American overlords. For example, Barkawi and Laffey argue that the U.S. “came increasingly to see the utility of local administrative and coercive apparatuses for the preservation of ‘order.’ ” Because the U.S. could rely on “indigenous forces” to secure “liberal spaces,” the authors assume that FSF development automatically enhanced the U.S.’s global security posture (1999: 407, 418-419). Similarly, William I. Robinson argues that U.S. efforts to “promote polyarchy” through military aid were in fact veiled attempts to integrate the periphery into the “international corporate political economy.” As he explains, “military aid created bridges between local forces and the U.S. military and established the prerequisite conditions for military, intelligence, and covert intervention where required” (1996: 80). But just because the U.S. armed and trained foreign armed forces does not necessarily mean that they would fit

seamlessly into its security apparatus. From the perspective of American strategists, the sovereignty of Third World States created centrifugal forces that could very well pull that apparatus apart. This perspective is neglected in Ellen Wood's notion of "new imperialism," which exerts itself through a network of (nominally) sovereign states. She fails to consider how such a network, by permitting greater latitude for "misbehavior" among the peripheral states, intensifies, rather than eases, the challenges of delegating security responsibilities to foreigners at the periphery (2003: 141). Ultimately, those scholars conflate the U.S.'s *desire* for control with *evidence* of control.

Policymakers recognized that that desire had to contend with FSF who might prove unreliable or uncooperative. Constructivist principal-agent theory recovers this ever-present possibility of agency slack and establishes analytical grounds for revising the functionalist interpretation of Cold War FSF development. The U.S. balanced its pursuit of control against the barriers to realizing it; those barriers show the logic of the U.S.'s Janus-faced rhetoric. As in any principal-agent problem, the principal wants the agent to act on its behalf, but there are agency costs incurred by delegating authority to those who might fail to share the principal's interests. In this specific instance, American officials articulated the costs of employing local soldiers through the rhetorical resources that decolonization and modernization had made available. Entrusting foreign military agents with American foreign policy seemed risky because their nationalism attached them to their own governments, which had their own policies and interests. FSF could very well stray from American objectives by supporting political leaders who adopted a non-capitalist program of socioeconomic development or simply by refusing any form of external authority. In this way, foreign nationalism constituted the social basis of the FSF agency problem.

By pinpointing this social basis, constructivist principal-agent theory explains how U.S. policymakers adapted their agency slack countermeasures—i.e., strategies for denying independence—to an international framework built upon the sovereignty of its constitutive parts. Participants in FSF discourse accepted the constraints of a post-WWII international system that granted formal sovereignty to even the most quasi of quasi states; they acknowledged that any exertion of influence over Third World militaries would have to navigate and manage those constraints. The decolonized world that the U.S. helped to institutionalize following World War II thus limited the internationalizing of its military manpower.²⁶

The U.S. Response

Early Cold War discourse on Third World military proxies generated four agency slack countermeasures for bringing them in line with a broad anti-communist strategy. I discuss three here and elaborate the fourth in the following section, as it follows directly from the discussion of modernization theory's treatment of Third World militaries. These countermeasures mediated between respect for sovereignty and an impulse to use these militaries as agents of the U.S. They included 1) monitoring FSF, 2) delimiting FSF training and equipment, and 3) bribing FSF and civilian leaders. The first offered a means of evaluating FSF development so that the U.S. could terminate military assistance if the recipient governments used it improperly. It also allowed the U.S. to evaluate the performance of MAP units. The second circumscribed the capabilities of FSF so that they could only perform the tasks deemed desirable by the U.S. The third, in contrast, sought to buy off governments and their FSF with more training and equipment than the U.S. considered militarily necessary. This quid pro quo granted material incentives to local

²⁶ For a discussion of how the social construction of “fundamental institutions” limits the options available to states, see Reus-Smit 1999.

military and political actors in return for their support of U.S. objectives, particularly military basing rights.

Countermeasure 1: Monitoring - “methods and procedures for evaluating and reporting” (2448)

One condition of American military assistance was that the U.S. monitored how recipient countries put that assistance to use. Much of this oversight came from U.S. military assistance advisory groups (MAAGs), teams of U.S. personnel operating within the host countries that administered military assistance to their local counterparts. One of the MAAGs’ chief concerns was “mirror imaging,” a practice by which recipient countries modeled their own militaries after the U.S. military. American officials considered this practice improper, since it defeated one of the main objectives of FSF development: raising FSF that were functionally dissimilar from the U.S. military. By the time of the Draper Committee, U.S. officials considered “mirror imaging” under control, due in part to existing monitoring, but still a threat to the effectiveness of MAP. As one committee report explained, “To a great extent ‘mirror imaging’ has been eliminated over past few years by Defense Directives, by Unified Commander’s ceilings, by better preparation of MAAG personnel, and by better program reviews...However, constant surveillance must be maintained to insure that it is held to an absolute minimum” (F1713). This “constant surveillance” provided feedback on just what kind of FSF U.S. military assistance was developing.

The U.S. also engaged in monitoring to evaluate the progress of the FSF units it armed and trained. FSF discourse agonized over the performance of these soldiers. For example, General George Schlatter, the senior Air Force officer on the staff of the unified Caribbean Command, emphasized the need for “better, or perhaps just for some sort of measurement

tools...a very common question is, ‘Well, how are these MAP units doing in Country X Getting any better?’ Well, how high is up? Better than what? Or how good is good?’ (F2894). Another Committee report “found it necessary to study in some detail indigenous performance capabilities in order to establish the extent to which indigenous personnel could or could not be expected to satisfactorily perform in military units and functions derived from our analysis of force-type requirements...”(F2908). In response to questions about FSF performance, officials created evaluation metrics. They measured, for example, the extent to which FSF units could contribute to U.S. military operations. Could FSF units “maintain internal stability and order,” “undertake field operations against an external enemy,” and “participate in combined operations with U.S. forces”? (F2885). They also measured FSF officer competency and professionalism. U.S. monitors wanted to know whether officers were “indifferent to troop welfare,” or if, instead, the officers “were eager for combat and confident in victory” (2886). In other evaluations, U.S. officials compared U.S. military performance—held as the benchmark—with several units from Pakistan, Vietnam, and Taiwan (F2908; F2909). These prototype evaluations, if accurate, were to be used with additional MAP recipients.

Countermeasure 2: Delimiting - “Need local forces—but there is a limit to what is needed” (F2154)

Maintaining “constant surveillance” helped to enforce the economy of military assistance. The point of this assistance was not to give FSF everything they wanted, but rather to provide only that which U.S. military planners thought they needed. U.S. planners determined this need based on how FSF could best serve U.S. security interests. The Draper Committee outlined three relevant criteria for how to develop FSF:

(1) the operational requirements if indigenous forces are to assume responsibilities for unilateral and combined operations, (2) the types of military units that must be developed if the operational requirements are to be fulfilled, and (3) the weapons and training needed if the indigenous military are to be prepared to carry out their responsibilities within the combined force concept (F2431).

The U.S. may not have been able to determine recipient countries' defense budgets directly, but it could delimit the military assistance it granted, and hence exert indirect influence over their militaries' makeup and capabilities (F2819).

Through this careful calculation of force requirements, FSF discourse emphasized the parameters within which FSF development would occur. Influencing FSF required U.S. planners to establish and police those parameters—in conjunction with host governments if possible, without them if necessary. U.S. officials made concessions to “joint-planning,” but only up to a point. One Draper Committee report explained that the “particular mission assigned to local forces should be agreed jointly with the other government to the greatest extent *feasible*” (F1609, emphasis added). Another report acknowledged that recipient countries might show “reluctance” in following the U.S.'s concept of force structure delimitation. This was a barrier, however, that U.S. planners had every intention of overcoming. The “establishment in the countries of joint combat developments groups, composed of personnel from the MAAG's working with the country forces can lead to a willing acceptance of the concept” (F1162; see also F1833). And, a third report sought to “reaffirm the desirability of increasing role of indigenous armed SVC [services] in MAP preparation. However, political and mil[itary] security considerations underlying our MA programming guidance and U.S. war plans, May [sic] preclude declassification of sufficient info to permit sound planning to be done by indigenous pers[onnel]” (F1502). FSF development always remained an instrument of U.S. security strategy.

The role of FSF depended on what that strategy required. FSF discourse never confused “joint-planning” for a coequal partnership between donor and recipient.

As mentioned above, U.S. strategists worried about “mirror imaging” (F1712). They had little use for poor copies of their own military. They wanted, instead, a cohesive but “variegated” international military organization (F1262). To develop such an organization, the U.S. tried to eliminate redundancy between its own forces and FSF. “We should avoid,” explained one Committee report, “developing indigenous capabilities which would duplicate those which the United States would be likely to deploy in the event of intervention” (F1710). For “internal security” and to hold off external attack until U.S. forces arrived, the U.S. looked to FSF. For expeditionary operations, the U.S. would employ its own military (F1880).

Representations of functional differences between U.S. and foreign forces reinforced this division of military labor. Unlike the U.S. military, which had no jurisdiction in civil law enforcement, FSF had experience fighting insurgencies and outlaws within their borders. U.S. fears about communist insurgencies and civil wars thus framed FSF as the logical first line of defense. The U.S. sought to perpetuate that functional specialization through its military assistance. This would prevent local forces from obtaining superfluous training and equipment, enable them to contain local aggression without U.S. intervention, and facilitate joint operations with the U.S. military if the U.S. ultimately had to intervene (F1162). From this perspective, using FSF primarily for “internal security” meant “manning” the “outlying ramparts” (F1394). This functional specialization of FSF became a geographic specialization and thus localized the U.S.’s global security posture.

Countermeasure 3: Bribing - “payment to a foreign government for services rendered” (2664)

To secure compliance, FSF discourse suggested targeting both civilian and military leaders with material incentives. In this way, military assistance could serve political, rather than strictly military, requirements.

The Draper Committee understood the importance of the “prestige” attached to American military equipment. In one of its published reports, the Committee noted that for “political and economic reasons which are related to overall strategic considerations, military assistance should give some consideration to the prestige aspirations of recipient governments...The display of military might can enhance, particularly in young nations, the standing of the incumbent regime” (F1778). While granting such equipment could violate the parameters of FSF delimitation, it could also, through a transactional quid pro quo, effect outcomes desirable to the U.S. Such outcomes included maintaining pro-U.S. regimes that might be under threat; bolstering internal security forces; steering foreign leaders away from Soviet aid; compelling reluctant countries to join U.S. defense pacts; and gaining “overseas air bases, naval bases, landing and transit rights” (F2664; F2697). More than the others, this countermeasure specifically confronted the problems posed to FSF development by the governments for which these armed forces ostensibly worked. It sought their compliance indirectly by buying off their political leaders.

This countermeasure granted assistance even when it transcended military necessity. Not surprisingly, it elicited contentiousness within FSF discourse. Military officials argued that political objectives corrupted what was, in fact, a strictly military program. These objectives muddled FSF planning, wasted resources, and hindered the U.S.’s ability to confront the Soviet Union in an actual shooting war (F2824; F2869; F3030). Other U.S. officials defended using military aid for political purposes by referencing the Mutual Security Act. It provided a rather broad justification for such aid: “to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of

the United States.” This allowed the U.S. to use the Military Assistance Program (MAP) “in the political and psychological strategy field rather than necessarily in pursuance of a U.S. military concept” (F2822). The conflict between delimiting military aid and using it to win favors demonstrates how these countermeasures could aim for the same objective—compliance—but through contradictory means.

The Special Character of Native Officers

In this section I explain two significant shifts in the history of U.S. foreign security force development: 1) from denigrating “native” officers to championing them and 2) from proscribing military partisanship to promoting it. These shifts contextualize socialization as the fourth agency slack countermeasure.

From 1899-1934, the U.S. treated its foreign security proxies as either racially backward or highly partisan, incapable of self-sufficiency, and hence in need of American officer oversight. Not surprisingly, the idea of “native” officers elicited derision. In the late 1950s and 1960s, however, the U.S. championed “indigenous” officers as leaders of American-trained and equipped units. When the Draper Committee scrutinized Cold War FSF development, the key to operational success turned on indigenous officers, their autonomy, and their alignment with U.S. interests. How did the U.S. overcome the “many misgivings as to the indigenous military potential that could be developed (F3273)? Put differently, how did foreign officers become a tool for covering the agency costs of outsourcing to Third World militaries?

Treating indigenous officers as the ideal targets of FSF development first required a general understanding of who these officers were and of where they stood in relation to a developing society. I argue that their place in the “throes of modernization” established their

potential as reliable security agents (F2722). FSF discourse drew from modernization theory²⁷ and its well-defined characterizations of Third World militaries (particularly of the officers) to structure the U.S.'s position towards foreign security proxies.

Some variants of modernization theory held a special place for Third World militaries. They maintained that these militaries were the only “native” organization capable of countering militant, well-disciplined communist parties. It also characterized officers as pro-Western modernizers—well educated, progressive, frustrated with corrupt elites, and eager to embrace a non-communist model of socioeconomic development. It was no surprise, therefore, that American officials welcomed “corrective” action on the part of Third World militaries in preventing the rise of communist regimes. As Latham explains, American policymakers “came to see the creation of modern, professional militaries as a progressive step. Such forces, they imagined, would defend societies in transition and create new sources of rational, enlightened authority as well” (2011: 124). Fluent in the language of “military modernization,” U.S. officials felt that “postcolonial militaries could play pivotal roles in accelerating modernization” along Western lines (2011: 131).

Academic voices offered authoritative statements on Third World militaries. In his 1959 *World Politics* article, Pauker drew attention to the “human material” that those militaries comprised. “The countries of Southeast Asia have in their officer corps,” he wrote, “men who are the product of an unusual process of natural selection. The emergence of national armies was a response to the need of achieving and consolidating independence. The officer corps seem to include some the new countries’ best human material, men with above-average qualities in

²⁷ It might be more precise to say that these representations responded to some of the unmet expectations of modernization theory. As Fukuyama points out, modernization theory assumed that “the good things of modernity go together” (2006: xii). When that confluence failed to transpire, especially in the political realm, modernization theorists (e.g., Pye, Rostow) and modernization-theory critics (e.g., Huntington) looked to Third World militaries to provide order and allow political development.

leadership, patriotism, and commitment to moral values” (1959: 339). In “Armies in the Process of Political Modernization,” Lucien Pye explained that native officers exist apart from their traditional, “backward” societies. Their induction into military life accelerated their “movement out of the particularistic relationships of traditional life and into the more impersonal and universalistic relationships of an industrial society” (1961: 80). Alienated from the traditionalism surrounding them, these officers become “extremely sensitive to the extent to which their countries are economically and technologically underdeveloped.” As a result, they “accept the fact that their countries are weak and the West is strong without becoming emotionally disturbed or hostile toward the West” (1962: 78-88). Pye extracted these officers from their respective societies and positioned them in relation to the “strength” of the First World, an arrangement that confronted them with the problem of underdevelopment.

In response, FSF officers became “modernizing agents” (80). Pye emphasized that militaries, as “industrial-type entities,” exude the “spirit of rapid technological development.” This “rational outlook” allowed Third World militaries “to champion responsible change and national development” (76). Pauker echoed this sentiment, noting that officers’ “natural propensities are progressive” (1959: 340). And Charles Windle and T.R. Vallance, also writing in *World Politics*, characterized Third World militaries as “instrument[s] of modernization.” They are, the authors wrote, “relatively modernized, industry-oriented institutions, sensitive to the need for technological competition, and in positions of leader to direct technological development” (1962: 95). One Draper Committee report championed the officer corps’s cosmopolitanism: the “armed forces, particularly the young officer corps, frequently represent the most enlightened and Western oriented group in the society. Many of the young officers have been educated abroad in Western schools and have been exposed to Western technology and

ideas” (F2807). Another report highlighted the officer corps’s national attachment: the “officer corps of the new nations are composed of some of the finest human material. They represent, on the whole, the most patriotic and politically moderate elements...the officer corps is young and dedicated; it enjoys the prestige of having fought for national independence” (F1792). Explained Pauker, the “officer corps of Southeast Asia, as fighters for independence, have a proprietary interest in their countries” and, as a result, have a large stake in their development (1959: 340).

Although he criticized modernization theory for matching economic development with political maturation, Samuel Huntington nevertheless agreed with its conception of Third World militaries. In fact, in Huntington’s view, the military could restore the order that economic development had disrupted and set the groundwork for political reform. Huntington noted that as an underdeveloped country develops, the

officer corps begins to acquire a distinctive character and esprit; its recruits are drawn more and more frequently from modest social backgrounds; its members receive unusual educational opportunities at home and abroad; the officers become receptive to foreign ideas of nationalism and progress; they develop distinctive managerial and technical skills rare elsewhere in society...the officers are the most modern and progressive group in the society...[They] become more and more disgusted with the corruption, incompetence, and passivity of the ruling oligarchy (1968: 201).

Huntington also quoted at length Charles Anderson, who highlighted Third World officers’ middle-class, reformist nature: “By virtue of place of residence, education, social contacts, economic status and aspiration, and social attitudes, they identify more closely with the emergent middle class than with the economic elites” (quoted in Huntington 1968: 207). In this sense, the officers sought for their own societies what the middle-class in the First World already enjoyed: stability, economic security, and a responsive government. While officers shared these aspirations with other emerging “social forces,” their discipline, nationalism, organization, and

access to the means of violence elevated their societal influence above competing actors (1968: 8).

The Draper Committee recognized that Third World militaries would play a role in promoting “internal security” amid internal instability (F3112). Beyond mere policing, enforcing internal security meant quelling any unrest that threatened “stability,” whether from lawlessness or, more importantly, from communist participation in the electoral process. As the Committee pointed out, the “new nation’s forces...are a key in the maintenance of internal security and largely determine whether stability or instability characterizes the routine of government” (F1818; see also F3356). The Committee saw the indigenous officer corps as a bulwark against the growth of communist parties throughout the Third World:

Communism may overrun these critical areas of the world unless a political and social counter-force, well-organized, disciplined, ably led and dedicated to common goals is developed. The present system of political parties does not appear capable of producing such a counter-force which can match the quasi-military organization of communist parties...It is becoming increasingly evident that the *military officer corps and the national armies provide the most effective non-communist leadership and organizational structures to be found in many of these countries* (F2579, emphasis added).

Reflecting a radical discursive shift from the pre-WWII era, the Draper Committee condoned U.S.-supported forces toppling civilian governments when necessary and usurping power for themselves (F1792). This understanding of Third-World civil-military relations invalidated civilian authority whenever civilians “abused” it. The U.S. feared that, facing underdevelopment, political leaders would accept communist influence and adopt “reckless” policies. This fear led U.S. policymakers to treat FSF as an anti-communist insurance policy. As one report argued, FSF officers “are at once the guardians of the government and the guarantors that the government keeps faith with the aspirations of the nation...In the discharge of these responsibilities, they must be prepared to assume the reins of government themselves.” Another

report lamented the scourge of “self-serving politicians and inefficient bureaucracies.” To correct these government abuses, the report championed FSF, which had the discipline and goal-oriented determination to rise above petty politics and govern. By “displacing civilian authority and assuming political responsibility,” the Committee argued, these officers “have placed their countries on the road to stability and government efficiency” (F1792). The main task, wrote Pauker, was “to utilize the organizational strength of the national armies and the leadership potential of their officer corps as temporary kernels of national integration, around which the other constructive forces of the various societies could rally, during a short period of breakthrough from present stagnation to genuine developmental take-off” (1959: 342).

The irony of the U.S., the champion of democracy, condoning military rule “as an alternative to parliamentary chaos” was not lost in FSF discourse (F2590). Pauker conceded that, “our liberal tradition makes it repugnant to contemplate regimes controlled by military elements rather than by the civilian instrumentalities of representative governments.” But he went on to argue that, “the hope for genuinely representative government is premature. The choice rather is between some form of tutelage that would leave the future open for development in a democratic direction, or political disintegration, economic stagnation, and social confusion” (1959: 343). Similarly, a Draper Committee report acknowledged that the “idea of supporting a preemptive coup violates a number of U.S. principles and practices, and may pose a dilemma.” But, the report argued, democracy is a privilege gained through struggle, not an automatic right of statehood, especially among underdeveloped countries:

[O]ur political rules are relevant in our own political context and not necessarily in others...In many of the underdeveloped countries...regimes are far from democratic and military forces are active agents in politics. This may not be to our liking; it may merely be preferable to anarchy or communism. The relevant question in such cases is whether power is exercised to advance or retard the interests of the country and the free world (F1889).

From this perspective, FSF officers could, under the proper influence, counteract the temptations of communism through orderly progress. Their aim was not perpetual authoritarianism, but rather political maturation, albeit achieved if necessary through military rule (F2338).

The U.S. hardly wanted military dictatorships to endure. As Pye explained, the U.S. should not treat FSF development as an end in of itself, since that could lead to political ossification and the perpetuation of military rule. The “objective,” Pye argued, “must remain the development of stable representative institutions and practices” (88). Even in classified materials, U.S. policymakers worried that military assistance would aid and perhaps prolong military dictatorships.

FSF officers had such appeal precisely *because* they (ostensibly) shared this worry. As described in FSF discourse, these officers wanted democracy to flourish, but only once the proper preconditions were in place. U.S. policymakers thus argued that military rule by “enlightened” officers could actually incubate democratic institutions (F1365). “Democracy,” the Committee explained, “cannot be easily transplanted: It must be grafted onto indigenous traditions and requires a period of preparation before it can take effective root in Asian and African societies” (F1792). Who better to oversee that preparation than progressive, patriotic military officers?

This role for the officer corps in developing countries, as defined within this Cold War FSF discourse, had obvious implications for U.S. military assistance programs. Pauker put it bluntly: “To succeed in the competition with communism, the officer corps will need substantial economic and technical assistance” (1959: 341). As the Draper Committee explained, a “main problem of underdeveloped countries is to develop organizational know-how and firm political leadership. *Both of these purposes can be linked to military programs*” (F1778, emphasis added).

One Committee report encouraged policymakers “to recognize the actual and potential role of the military as a focus of power and stability in otherwise underdeveloped and unstable areas. A proper development of the military can do much to provide discipline and leadership in unstable areas” (F2823). Another report connected the domestic role for Third World militaries to their usefulness for U.S. foreign policy: “In many underdeveloped countries, the military plays a dominant role in the political, economic, and social evolution of the society. It is, therefore, in the interest of the US *to exercise the maximum degree of influence over military leaders in such countries*” (F2338, emphasis added).

The Draper Committee recognized the officer corps as a “transmission belt” of U.S. influence abroad. Open to new ideas, these officers would accept external assistance from the U.S. Alienated from their society by their military vocation, they would remain impervious to pressures from local communists. And, concerned about “progress,” they would promote non-communist modes of capitalist development (F1630). The military’s special place within modernization made it attractive for U.S. foreign aid programs; the officers’ leading role within these organizations made them the logical focus for U.S. FSF development.

Countermeasure 4: Socializing - “a broadly gauged sociological and organizational undertaking” (F3345).

Whereas FSF proponents from the earlier period countered skeptics by treating FSF as trainable (with the right trainers), proponents during the Cold War countered their critics by treating FSF officers as socializable (with the right socializers). If the U.S. could inculcate within foreign ranks pro-American sentiments and create reliable, self-disciplined allies, compliance with American objectives would become possible *without direct control*. This arrangement would respect “nationalist pride”—a sentiment that “should be respected and reinforced”—but

still extend U.S. influence (Pauker 1959: 344). Socialized FSF officers would become subjects in both senses of the term: they would remain autonomous subjects, outside the American military hierarchy, but their autonomy would remain subject to American indoctrination.²⁸ Socialization bred de facto influence over FSF whose governments retained de jure sovereignty. By internalizing U.S. strategic interests, foreign officers in the service of their own governments would still fall under American authority. Internalizing those interests would render that authority profound but also invisible, and thus difficult to condemn as an affront to Third World state sovereignty.

This emphasis on socialization became possible once American officials no longer calculated agency costs in racial terms. Socialization could only occur in individuals considered capable of changing. As Latham explains, since the “inherent limits associated with fixed biology and racial destiny were replaced by an understanding grounded in the malleability of culture, the idea of transforming foreign societies gained greater credibility. In the post-World War II understanding, contact with modernity would not eliminate deficient races, but it would utterly transform deficient cultures” (2011: 22). The malleability of foreign military personnel was a prerequisite to their socialization.

New statehood facilitated this malleability. As the Committee noted, in “some countries indigenous armed forces are in formative stages and service traditions, attitudes, and codes of conduct are still being developed.” Now was the time for the U.S. to introduce the “spirit of freedom and democracy” and deliver a “significant psychological impact” (F1889). Other voices described this malleability as a function of socioeconomic underdevelopment. General Schlatter stated that Latin American “countries are by and large economically certainly broke, or

²⁸ See Doty 1996 for an extended discussion of the dual meaning of “subject.”

broker... They are backward. *[But t]here is nothing wrong with Latin American brains that training won't cure.* I think you might say they are ignorant rather than stupid. To me there is quite a difference" (2894-2895, emphasis added). Note that this utterance treated the "brain," not behavior, as the problem to be solved; the U.S. had to correct not just what FSF did, but how and what they thought. Like so many others, this utterance reflected the psychological preoccupation within Cold War FSF discourse.²⁹ Also, seeing FSF as "ignorant rather than stupid" established a crucial distinction, one probably more significant than Schlatter recognized. Foreign troops had much to learn, for sure, but their special character made them capable of learning it. Without that capability, the U.S. would be unable to imprint its interest on their psyche.

As a means of aligning agents with the principal's interests, socialization became the fourth agency slack countermeasure of this early Cold War period. The Draper Committee proposed military training as the best means of effecting it. In one of the committee's summary reports, it noted how

training as a form of military assistance... may be more valuable to the U.S. in the long than the providing of weapons and equipment... This assistance does far more than merely teach recipients to use military equipment and materials. The training program brings foreign nationals into contact with our representatives, involves teaching them to speak English, and in many other ways orients them to the values of our civilization and way of life. This is particularly true where the training is conducted within the United States (F1532; see also F1778, F2330).

This training transcended mere technical instruction and its political aims went far deeper than bribing FSF leaders. Rather, training became a way of orienting FSF, especially the officers, towards an American "way of life." Given that these officers might one day serve as political leaders, it made sense for U.S. policymakers to "keep future allied leadership oriented to our

²⁹ Additional evidence of this preoccupation can be seen in the U.S. military's emphasis on "psychological warfare" in counterinsurgency operations. As Latham explains, scholars of this era engaged in "analyses linking psychology, development, and modernization" (2011: 47). For an academic example of this preoccupation with the mental states of those undergoing modernization, see Huntington 1968: 32-39.

side” (F2398). Training capitalized on the nature of FSF officers described above—i.e., progressive, anti-communist, open to new ideas, and envious of the U.S. As American policymakers saw it, foreign officers taking part in training programs would internalize U.S. interests, which would obviate material incentives or direct oversight. The attractiveness of the American model—its unparalleled military, high standard of living, internal order—amplified by charismatic U.S. trainers, would be enough to link the foreign officer corps with the objectives of American Cold War strategy. This countermeasure aimed to turn FSF into voluntary, self-governing agents, which would eliminate the principal-agent problem altogether.

American officials felt that bringing foreign officers into the U.S. to train and live would facilitate their socialization. FSF discourse emphasized the draw of American “soft power” (Nye 2004). Explained one committee report: “The effect upon Allied military personnel brought to the U.S. for training cannot be overemphasized. Thrown into U.S. society, these men cannot escape having their thinking and their standards affected” (F2339). Another report asserted that, “a large majority of [FSF] returned to their homeland with an orientation in consonance with the objectives of U.S. policy” (F3380). And a third explained that the “training of foreign military in U.S. military schools has benefits far beyond the acquiring of new military skills. Something of the American spirit is caught at the same time” (F3177).

Transferring that “spirit,” whether in the U.S. or abroad through mobile training teams (MTTs) and MAAGs, depended on American advisors. The committee regarded them as a “key influence in the development of military leaders of superior motivation and integrity” (F1626). It explained that the “intangible inputs to leadership can only be supplied by individuals, and particularly the members of the Country Team, who have direct contact with the foreign elites” (F1632). A committee report evaluated extant advisory work as making “inestimable”

contributions to the interests of both the host country and to the U.S. (F1823). Another report encouraged “strengthening the pro-Western orientation of internal security forces through the day to day association of U.S. advisers with the members of foreign internal security forces” (F3115). These advisors provided the point of contact between FSF and the U.S., connecting the former to the latter.

Given the importance attached to this advisory role, committee reports held that only the best American personnel were qualified to perform it. Socialization required perspicacious American advisors with a special sensitivity for foreign cultures. As one report argued, it “is of critical importance...that we utilize only our best representatives in such training.” This same report emphasized that advisors demonstrate detailed “knowledge” of the countries from which FSF originate. This knowledge ranged from the “attitudes, aspirations, and pulse of the populace” to “the temper of the political opposition and the major political issues involved” (F1823). The advisor thus had to become expertly familiar with what his advisees confronted at home, particularly when it came to political and social unrest. Such familiarity could make him better equipped to ascertain and exploit his advisees’ particular fears, worries, and desires. To socialize foreign soldiers, therefore, it was imperative that their American counterparts knew them.

Employing socialization as an agency slack countermeasure indicates just how metaphysical the terrain of the Cold War FSF development had become. The U.S. sought to control its foreign military agents by infiltrating their minds. Its mission was a “favorable psychological impact” (F2340; see also F3018). As discussed above, modernization theory framed Third World militaries as potential U.S. allies, given their place in decolonization and modernization. Socialization promised to realize that potential. It represented the ultimate “force

multiplier,” as it created armed allies who internalized American values. And so, since the 1950s, FSF development has integrated socialization mechanisms—psychological manipulation and the inculcation of beliefs—into its training programs (F2941).

Consider the assumptions that were necessary to paint socialization as a viable agency slack countermeasure. It required faith both in the receptiveness of foreign, adult soldiers to foreign authority and in the capacity of Americans to engender that authority. Not surprisingly, at least one text within FSF discourse denounced socialization as a dubious proposition: “We have neither the power, the wisdom, nor the right to impose our own ideas and values on other nations. They would react as violently to our attempts to do so as we would to similar efforts to influence our internal affairs and social ideas” (F1728). Other texts, however, eclipsed this skepticism and enshrined socialization as a primary objective of FSF development, an objective that endures today, despite ongoing controversies over its effectiveness (F1437; I discuss those controversies in the next chapter).

Economic vs. Military Aid

FSF opponents criticized military aid for conveying a “militaristic image” of the U.S. They worried that military aid neglected and perhaps exacerbated the economic problems facing the developing world. As a result, they wanted to cut funding for the MAP and redirect it into economic assistance programs. A letter from eight concerned senators serving on the Foreign Relations Committee summarized the case against the MAP: “Over-emphasis on military assistance has...distracted attention, energy and perhaps economic aid, from more pressing problems” (2805).

This letter caught the attention of the Draper Committee. To defend the continuation and expansion of the MAP, the committee reiterated the notions that foreign officers were socio-economically modern, open to U.S. assistance, and capable of being socialized. Within FSF discourse, those representations revealed the potential for foreign militaries to effect economic objectives—the very objectives that MAP detractors had emphasized. Seeing foreign militaries as agents of modernization enabled officials “to reconcile support for development with the empowerment of security forces” (Latham 2011: 131). Even more, integrating economic objectives into military assistance offered another means of strengthening the links within the U.S.’s international network of military power.

The Committee addressed its critics by disabusing them of the distinction between economic and military aid. “Our economic and military assistance programs are not mutually exclusive. The dichotomy which is often posed in public discussion between these two forms of aid can be extremely misleading” (F1786). First, the committee noted that, “military security is a prerequisite for healthy political and economic development” (F2807). Second, the committee made clear that “vocational and technical skills developed by the military services have wide application in the civilian economy as well” (F1804). In another report, it declared “the role of the military establishments in promoting social and economic progress may, in some cases, be as important as their contribution to the deterrence of direct military aggression” (F1821). Finally, FSF discourse highlighted the economic contributions of military “civic action” programs. Such programs employed FSF in “projects useful to the local populations at all levels in such fields as education, training, public works, agriculture, transportation, communications, health, sanitation, and others contributing to economic and social development” (quoted in Barber and Ronning 1966: 6). Bienen elucidated the connection among civic action, development, and security: “civic

action is designed to encourage and support usage of local forces in activities that contribute to economic and social development and to assist in the prevention and elimination of insurgencies inimical to free world interest by improving the relations between army and population” (1971: 26). Through these formulations of the MAP, FSF discourse created a common purpose for military and economic assistance.

The committee also emphasized that FSF, under the proper U.S. guidance, provided the best material for advancing economic, not just military, development:

If the military is properly led, indoctrinated and motivated, the activities open to it are numerous...An informed soldiery, widely based, is in an ideal position to transmit to the populace the thrust of its own indoctrination...Where direct military assistance to community projects is feasible...the army can demonstrably advance economic and social objectives (1630).

Officers in particular provided an “important source of national leaders and public administrators” (F1821). MAP training could, for example, enable them to become “potential leaders for public administration, the professions, politics, civic affairs and other nonmilitary activities” (F1818). From this perspective, developing FSF translated into “an increasing body of disciplined and educated military officers, loyal to their country, devoted to its economic and political development, and presumably friendly to the United States” (F1957). By championing the economic potential of foreign officers, FSF discourse eroded the “militaristic” image of U.S. military assistance and reframed it in economic terms (F2806).

Conclusion

Early Cold War FSF discourse, largely encapsulated in the Draper Committee, recognized, but also sought to overcome, the challenges of outsourcing security responsibilities to foreign soldiers from underdeveloped countries. As a result, the U.S. implemented agency

slack countermeasures that contrasted sharply with those used before WWII. Instead of raising units and commanding them with American officers, the U.S. now had to engage with nationalist militaries with their own officers, answerable to their own political authorities. This new engagement involved monitoring these militaries, delimiting the kinds of military assistance provided to them, and bribing them to perform the desired behavior. These countermeasures reflected the new Cold War environment of U.S. foreign security force development.

U.S. FSF discourse also expended considerable energy attempting to understand the identity of Third World soldiers. Their domestic background, educational level, aspirations, frustrations, ideological orientation—even their psychology—came under scrutiny by the U.S. policymakers responsible for developing FSF. This discourse made sense of FSF development by generating characterizations of the people who filled those foreign ranks. Informed by modernization theory, these characterizations revealed the special role that the military played within underdeveloped societies undergoing decolonization and modernization. While the armed forces were undoubtedly nationalistic, they were also modern, anti-communist, engines of socioeconomic development, and thus of great potential use to U.S. interests.

These characterizations gave the U.S. confidence in using FSF agents from sovereign countries. In contrast to how the U.S. infantilized “native” soldiers between 1899 and 1934, Cold War discourse prized FSF, particularly the officers, for their capacity to act as proxies without direct supervision. This discourse thus outlined a way for U.S. policymakers to develop foreign security proxies who remained under their own sovereign states but who could still be counted on to advance U.S. strategic objectives. In combination with the three other countermeasures, socialization attempted to exert indirect, but profound, influence over Third World states’ defense policies and socioeconomic development.

In the next chapter, I highlight the challenges of relying on indirect countermeasures, especially socialization, when the U.S. redefined the FSF agency problem around the threat of human rights abuse and FSF brutality.

Chapter 6:

Putting the Moral in ‘Moral Hazard’: Human Rights and FSF Development, 1976-Present

“U.S. Security Assistance to Central American must be viewed in the context of ...the degree to which military forces are avoiding blatant abuses that alienate the civilian populations and poison the climate in the United States for the provision of security assistance” – Strategy Paper for the National Security Council, 1980 (F5126)

“The United States Government has a right to demand certain minimum standards of respect for human rights as a condition for providing military aid to any country” – Kissinger Commission Report on El Salvador, 1984 (F5505).

“Shut Down the School of the Americas and Change Oppressive U.S. Foreign Policy” – School of the Americas Watch poster, 2008

Introduction

Why did “human rights” become a concern of United States foreign security force development in the late 1970s? How did the U.S. respond to this concern? In this chapter, I trace how an alliance of human rights advocates, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and members of Congress, de-legitimated the common Cold War practice of entrusting illiberal, anti-communist agents with American arms and training. This alliance cohered in an era when Congress had grown assertive in shaping foreign policy, particularly towards international human rights, and when the Carter Administration had institutionalized human rights as a foreign policy objective (Sikkink 2004). Seizing on the controversial counterinsurgency assistance to El Salvador and counternarcotics assistance to Colombia, members of Congress and NGOs implicated U.S. foreign policy in the behaviors of abusive militaries and their paramilitary auxiliaries. These foreign security forces, both regular and irregular, assassinated priests and nuns, massacred entire villages, tortured civilians and enemy combatants, and often refused to take prisoners of war, opting for summary executions instead. Not only did such behaviors

conflict with professed American values, they also alienated the local populations from their respective governments—the very opposite of what a successful counterinsurgency mandated. Ultimately, the Congressional-NGO alliance framed the risk of human rights abuse as the salient agency cost within the U.S.-FSF agency relationship. Within this framing, U.S. defense policy moved, albeit slowly, to navigate the moral and strategic hazards of outsourcing security responsibilities to human-rights abusers. Thus, while past definitions of the FSF agency problem centered on security proxies' racial inferiority, partisanship, or nationalism, the focus now turned to their disregard for human rights. That disregard constituted their specific flaw as foreign security agents. In response, the U.S. implemented agency slack countermeasures designed specifically to correct it.

That the U.S. would seek humane security proxies might strike some as subterfuge. A functionalist counterargument would hold that the human rights abuses committed by security proxies in El Salvador and Colombia evince the real plan of U.S. foreign security force development. If the security proxies committed abuse, so this argument goes, then the U.S. must have wanted it committed. Indeed, some argue that the U.S. trained and armed known human rights abusers because it saw their brutality as necessary for rooting out communism, protecting U.S. business interests, and prosecuting the “War on Drugs” (McClintock 1985; Gareau 2004; Gill 2004). From this perspective, the brutality of foreign armed forces was an asset to the U.S., not a liability; calls for reforming those forces belied what the U.S. really wanted from them. This perspective treats the American pro-human rights position as a smokescreen with little effect on actually policymaking.

But that position signified more than a smokescreen, even though critics are right to question the sincerity of U.S. human rights rhetoric. Constructivist principal-agent theory squares

that statement by distinguishing discourse from individual belief, by allowing discourse to constrain actors who may not personally believe its content, and by permitting heterogeneity among the principal's constitutive actors. This treatment of discourse draws from Schimmelfennig (2001) and follows from the Wittgensteinian notion that language is inextricably public. Individuals engage meaningfully within their community's discourse by following its rules and by drawing from its rhetorical resources. A collective process among the interlocutors generates, enforces, and revises those rules, and those rules assign different normative values to each rhetorical resource. The rules and resources available remain largely outside an individual's control and may not match what that individual "sincerely" believes. The salience of a discursive theme—such as human rights—thus neither implies nor requires that any particular individual has internalized it. All that matters is that the theme enjoys legitimacy, i.e., public consent, which is distinct from private acceptance (Weber 2002).

In this case, an alliance of NGOs and members of Congress connected "human rights," a broad theme invested with positive normative value, to the specific practice of developing foreign security proxies. Drawing that connection demarcated a rule within official foreign policy discourse: a country claiming to champion the universality and inalienability of human rights could not at once support or even tolerate foreign security proxies who violated them, since proxies reflect back on those they serve. This rule clarified the problem of associating with human rights abusers. As a result, it constrained U.S. officials who might have dismissed human rights as irrelevant to security outsourcing. Even the act of breaking the rule would affirm its existence, as I show later in the chapter.

And the critics are right that many U.S. officials resisted the human rights rhetoric coming from Congress and NGOs and did break the rule. Unlike previous definitions of the FSF

agency problem, the definition centering on human rights did not originate from the U.S. military, State Department, or (with the exception of the Carter Administration) the White House. Many in those institutions felt that the tactical problem of FSF brutality should not derail strategic objectives, like defeating communist insurgents or eradicating coca production. President Reagan, for example, insisted on supporting the Salvadoran armed forces throughout his two terms, despite their repeated human rights abuses. And President Clinton did the same with the abusive Colombian armed forces, even exploiting a loophole in Congressional restrictions to continue assisting their counternarcotics operations.

I argue, however, that the NGO-Congressional alliance had rendered the threat of human rights violations a problem that even the skeptics had to manage, if not overcome, in their dealings with foreign security proxies. This alliance lodged that threat so deeply into the conversation about security outsourcing that avoiding it became impossible. Through “rhetorical entrapment” (Schimmelfennig 2001), it became the prominent agency cost of doing business with foreign armed forces—whether hardened adherents to *realpolitik* believed in it or not. The currency of human rights ultimately cornered all officials into acknowledging that brutal security proxies hurt U.S. interests, if not morally, then at least strategically. While some U.S. officials may not have found the brutality personally offensive, they still recognized that it offended others, particularly legislators, NGOs, and the local populations enduring the abuse.

Contestation among the principal’s constitutive actors set the stage for disagreement over how to respond to this agency problem. Some in Congress and civil society argued that the U.S. should punish human rights abusers by cutting ties with them, effectively breaking the principal-agent relationship. Others, especially those in the executive who prioritized strategic objectives, argued that, to the contrary, engagement with human rights abusers should be maintained, as it

offered a means of leveraging their reform. Out of these competing approaches emerged two agency slack countermeasures for mitigating FSF brutality: 1) the U.S. could threaten to terminate aid if human rights violations continued, then follow through on that threat, and thus make aid conditional on the kinds of behavior that it wanted. That was called conditionality. And 2) the U.S. could train its military proxies to internalize and value the behaviors that it wanted. That was socialization. The enduring threat of inhumane proxies in El Salvador and then in Colombia sparked debate over which countermeasure could best align those proxies with U.S. strategy. While differing in their respective logics, both countermeasures were ultimately legitimized as a means of promoting human rights.

In the sections that follow, I trace how the issue of human rights cornered skeptics and animated debate over the proper foreign policy towards El Salvador and Colombia. I begin by discussing “congressional activism” from the 1970s (Sikkink 2004). This activism took input from human rights NGOs and focused attention on the human rights records of governments that received military aid (Sikkink 2004: 52). Next, I show how growing attention on abuse brought into sharp relief the abusive behavior of the Salvadoran armed forces, a key proxy in the fight against communism. The failure of the U.S. to reform their behavior, despite more than a decade of conditional assistance and socialization, kept the debate alive when the U.S. developed security forces in Colombia. Worries about the Colombian military’s humaneness led to the Leahy Law. Named for Senator Patrick Leahy, it made military assistance conditional on the behavior of individual military units, rather than on the behavior of governments. Finally, I chart the influence of School of the Americas Watch (SOAW), an NGO that has drawn its moral outrage from the murders of priests and nuns in El Salvador, staged rallies outside the School of the Americas, and solidified ties with Congressional allies. SOAW has pushed for an extreme

version of conditionality—one that would close the school—and has criticized the U.S. for teaching inhumane military practices. This emphasis on curriculum and the particular behaviors it promotes has allowed the school (now called the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation) to justify its existence by citing its curricular reforms.

Establishing the Principal’s Context: Putting Human Rights on the Military Assistance Agenda

U.S. human rights policy emerged from the political upheavals of the mid-1970s and broke dramatically from past practice. As Sikkink explains, in the 1960s, U.S. policy “support[ed] dictatorships publicly and openly.” In the 1970s, however, the U.S. “criticize[d] them” (2004: 51). She attributes this sudden shift to “congressional activism,” which subverted the dogmatic, single-mindedness of extant anticommunism by infusing it with moral complexity. The conventional formulation held that fighting communism always served the greater good; any non-communist government was morally preferable to a communist one. But human rights advocates exploded that formulation by showing how anti-communism and the greater good often worked at cross-purposes (2004: 52). By emphasizing how this Cold War dogmatism was tarnishing the U.S.’s self-image as a “rights-promoting state,” these advocates disclosed a rupture between professed American values and ongoing American practices, particularly the practice of military assistance. In this section, I show how those activists reactivated a language of human rights that had been dormant since the heady days following WWII (2004: 52, 56). Establishing the salience of that language is the first step towards explaining why, beginning in the 1970s, the risk of human rights violations became a problem for U.S. foreign policy in general and for foreign security force development in particular.

In the 1970s, a concatenation of factors aligned Congressional members with NGOs, shaped the contours of U.S. human rights policy, and produced concrete human rights initiatives. First, growing press coverage of international events from the 1960s and 1970s provided the kinds of resources that NGOs—including Amnesty International, the National Council of Churches, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and Americas Watch, among others—could readily muster when justifying and energizing their cause. These events included the U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965; the military coup in Greece in 1967; the rise of dictatorships in Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, and Argentina in the 1970s; and the ongoing abuses of a corrupt South Vietnamese government. Human rights advocates highlighted these events to show that U.S. foreign policy could no longer circumvent questions of human rights (Laurienti 2007: 27-28; Sikkink 2004: 48-69). A policy of anti-communism had been aligning the U.S. with illiberal governments that abused their own populations. Citing and publicizing that abuse drew a sharp contrast with the kinds of behaviors that American foreign policy supposedly championed. Critics exploited this contradiction to broach the subject of human rights within official foreign policy discourse (Sikkink 2004: 54).

Second, those international events piqued Congressional interest, particularly in the relationship between U.S. foreign policy and human rights. To satisfy that interest, Congress solicited the input of experts and advocates from civil society. Their voices, amplified via Congressional hearings, brought the human rights message to official foreign policy discussions. One set of hearings held by the House Subcommittee on International Organizations, in particular, turned those discussions into policy. Chaired by Representative Donald Fraser, these hearings synthesized insights on human rights protections into a “general vision” and policy blueprint (Sikkink 2004: 65). They featured testimony of “a didactic quality reminiscent of a

classroom,” edifying the committee members as well as the NGO representatives, State Department officials, lawyers, and academics who testified (Sikkink 2004: 68). Over the course of only four months in 1973, the Frazer subcommittee raised awareness of human rights violations and, most importantly, fashioned a reform agenda by focusing on U.S. complicity in them. As Sikkink explains, “Frazer was concerned by the dichotomy in the United States between professed beliefs and foreign policy, especially policy towards countries closely linked by military alliances or military aid” (2004: 66). Frazer’s subcommittee highlighted policy areas that, if reformed, could translate general human rights awareness into concrete demarches.

Third, Congress passed the War Powers Resolution in 1973 to signal of disapproval over the White House’s management of the Vietnam War. To “prevent ‘future Vietnams’,” this resolution required “early congressional review of any decision to send troops abroad” and empowered Congress “to compel a troop withdrawal once they had been committed” (Arnson 1989: 11). While it had little direct connection to military assistance or to foreign armed forces, the War Powers Resolution did encourage the outsourcing of U.S. military operations to foreign soldiers, as they could replace American troops whose deployment abroad would now prompt greater Congressional oversight. More broadly, the resolution injected Congress into debates over military strategy, an area that had been the purview of the executive. It also revealed a willingness of Congress to constrain foreign military interventions, foreshadowing the kinds of legislation that would later delimit missions related to foreign security force development.

Fourth, the fallout from Watergate and Vietnam created a groundswell during the 1974 congressional elections that brought to power the “Watergate babies,” a vocal cohort of reformist legislators (Arnson 1989: 11). As Arnson explains, this cohort pressed for, and then benefited from, amended Congressional rules that gave junior members more opportunities for

participation on committees (1989: 11). Exploiting these opportunities allowed reformers to embrace human rights as “a vehicle for Congress to attack the executive and assert greater control over foreign policy” (Sikkink 2004: 52). Legislators could mount their reform campaign by seizing on international human rights, given that the political status quo appeared incapable or unwilling to uphold them. Arson argues that the lessons of “propping up” a corrupt South Vietnamese government, in particular, weighed heavily among these new congressional reformers and directed their scrutiny to “the internal nature of regimes receiving U.S. assistance” (1989: 12).

And fifth, the presidency of Jimmy Carter triangulated the human rights agenda among the Executive, Legislature, and NGOs. Shortly after taking office in 1976, Carter proclaimed that he would not separate “the traditional issues of war and peace from the new global questions of justice, equity, and human rights” (quoted in Arson 1989: 26). Carter’s presidency heralded a shift in the executive’s foreign policy discourse. He had studied Amnesty International Reports on human rights abuses and was well versed in congressional activity related to human rights concerns (Sikkink 2004: 75). His sensitivity to these issues fostered an “environment that encouraged and allowed human rights issues to take centerstage, *particularly as the issue pertained to security assistance*” (Laurienti 2007: 35, emphasis added). While Arson argues that “world events and domestic pressures” pushed Carter to equivocate on human rights at the end of his term (1989: 26), Sikkink counters by noting how Carter still managed to build an enduring human rights legacy within the foreign policy establishment. She argues that, because of Carter’s affirmation of congressional activism, those rights gained a “high profile and institutional status” that future presidents found difficult to diminish (2004: 73). In other words, “human rights” had become a durable rhetorical resource within government institutions.

The discursive, compositional, and institutional reshaping within Congress led to human rights initiatives that the Carter Presidency later reinforced. These initiatives included legislation that made military assistance conditional on the observance of human rights, that integrated human rights instruction into training for foreign soldiers, and that instituted a new focus on human rights within the State Department. First, in 1973 Congress updated the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to make military assistance contingent on human rights protections. Governments that received aid from the U.S. would now be responsible for upholding human rights within their borders. Section 502(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act required, “for the first time,” that the U.S. Government prohibit military assistance “to countries that engaged ‘in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights’ ” (quoted in Sikkink 2004: 69). Carter later supported a strengthened version of Section 502(b) and encouraged “country specific legislation to limit or eliminate military aid to numerous countries” (Laurienti 2007: 35).

Second, Congress further updated the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by codifying a new U.S. training program for foreign soldiers. Enacted under the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program became a means of “increase[ing] the awareness of nationals of foreign countries participating in such activities of basic issues involving internationally recognized human rights” (quoted in Liang-Fenton 2004: 443). To increase that “awareness,” IMET invited foreign soldiers into the U.S. and encouraged them to “form durable relationships” with their American counterparts (House 1976: 20). These relationships were to engender respect for human rights by exposing foreign soldiers to American military personnel and their culture.

And third, reform in the State Department “institutionalized the human rights idea” within foreign policy (Sikkink 2004: 70). In 1973, Congress created the Office of Human Rights, later called the Bureau of Humanitarian Affairs and Human rights. As Sikkink explains, this bureau “bore the responsibility for assuring that human rights concerns were brought into all aspects of U.S. foreign policy” (2004: 70). In addition, Congress now required the State Department to generate annual reports on prospective recipients of military aid. These reports evaluated the “observance and respect for internationally recognized human rights in each country proposed as a recipient of security assistance” (quoted in Sikkink 2004: 69). They enabled Congress to determine whether foreign governments qualified for military aid according to Section 503(b) stipulations. And in 1976, “Congress created the post of Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs in the State Department.” This post involved “overseeing all human rights matters in the department” (Laurienti 2007: 34). Carter further entrenched these reforms by appointing “staunch human rights backers” to the department’s human rights bureau (2007: 35).

These initiatives formed a policy framework that the U.S. would later activate and expand in its dealings with El Salvador and Colombia (Laurienti 2007: 34; see also Sikkink 2004: 70). This framework made available four generic agency slack countermeasures: material inducements, monitoring, screening, and socialization. To target the specific threat of inhumane military proxies, U.S. policymakers combined the first three countermeasures to make military assistance conditional on the recipient’s respect for human rights. In addition, they implemented human rights training as an engine of the fourth countermeasure.

These two general approaches—conditionality and socialization—suffered, however, from problems of implementation. The executive, responsible for providing data on foreign governments’ observance of human rights, could manipulate those data if it wanted to. And the

potential for manipulation was even greater when the U.S. required foreign governments to provide data on their own troops. Moreover, the President could override human rights conditionality if an “emergency” required it. Worse, ascertaining the actual values that foreign troops held inside their heads was impossible, so there was no way to tell for sure whether socialization had proven successful. Such ambiguity perpetuated contestation among the executive, Congress, and NGOs over the effectiveness of conditionality and socialization within foreign security force development.

El Salvador: Human Rights Meets Counterinsurgency - “[T]he violent traditions of El Salvador must be kept in mind as we work to improve the human rights situation there” (J. B. Atwood to M. McHugh, 10/22/80: 4)

In this section, I demonstrate how the U.S. intervention in El Salvador redirected attention from military assistance in general to a particular recipient of American arms and training. In the 1980s, the U.S. treated the communist insurgency in El Salvador as a threat not only to the Salvadoran government, but also to its own national interests. At the same time, it refused to repeat its experience in Vietnam by deploying thousands of its own troops to El Salvador. This position betrayed a critical vulnerability. While the American military could arm, train, and advise the Salvadoran armed forces, it could not fight alongside them or fight in their place (Danner 1993: 41). And Congress had limited the number of in-country American trainers to a scant 55 (Cline 2006: 425). Thus the U.S. had to rely almost completely on the Salvadoran armed forces to prosecute a major battle in the war against communism. It was clear, therefore, that these forces served as U.S. proxies.³⁰ And by serving in this role, especially for such an important task, they became the targets of intense scrutiny.

³⁰ This proxy role was not lost on the Salvadorans. A State Department cable recounts a Salvadoran military officer explaining to his American counterparts that “U.S. officials in Washington should realize something

As I show, the salience of “human rights” within foreign policy discourse informed that scrutiny—whether it came from Congress or the Reagan White House—and presented Salvadoran proxies as inhumane brutes from an inherently violent society. Whether for moral or for strategic reasons—or for both—U.S. policymakers treated the Salvadoran military’s record of human rights abuse as evidence that it was “unlike us” and thus unreliable as an instrument of American Cold War strategy. This invocation of alterity vis-à-vis the “traditional understandings of U.S. identity” constructed the social basis of goal incongruity between the U.S. principal and its Salvadoran security agents (Sikkink 2004: 56).

Central America was a Cold War flashpoint during the late 1970s and 1980s. Nicaragua’s fall to communism in 1979 galvanized concern that other countries in the region, particularly El Salvador, would follow suit. El Salvador, like Cuba before 1959 or Nicaragua before 1979, faced a “bourgeoning insurgency” with well-founded grievances (McClintock 1985: 63). Inspired by Marxism-Leninism and Liberation Theology, an assortment of leftist groups coalesced into the Faribundo Marti National Liberation Front (FLMN) and grew to an insurgency 12,000 strong (Bacevich et al. 1988: 4). The FLMN exploited broad disenchantment with the Salvadoran government, whose “ineptitude and harshness” had done little to curb macroeconomic volatility, extreme inequality, political disenfranchisement, and “widespread official corruption” (Bacevich et al 1988: 3). El Salvador’s authoritarian, inequitable, and corrupt status quo presented an easy target for leftist revolutionaries (ibid).

The job of defending that status quo fell to the Salvadoran armed forces (ESAF), a military in which the U.S. had little confidence. In 1979, one American observer called it “a militia of 11,000 that had no mission.” Another remarked that its activities were limited to

that Salvadorans have known for several years: that Salvadoran soldiers are shedding their blood in the fight against communism so that U.S. soldiers will not have to do the same” (CIA, 1/25/84: 2).

“sitting in garrison abusing civilians” (quoted in Bacevich et al. 1988: 24). And the State Department considered it “a possibly fatally corrupt military organization” (Robert White to Department of State, 1/16/81). In their report, Bacevich and his coauthors—a group of mid-level American military officers—emphasized that the ESAF could therefore only defeat the FLMN if it underwent a dramatic transformation: “Remaking ESAF into a force that could hold its own against the guerrillas required equipment and tactical competence.” But beyond mere technical training, the ESAF also “required more fundamental change, starting with [its] view of its own role in the nation” (1988: 24). Why, from the U.S. perspective, did this view need to change?

In the early 1980s, it became clear that the ESAF was violating human rights irrespective of the moral and strategic costs involved. Abusing the local population struck U.S. policymakers as counterproductive. It made for bad counterinsurgency because it offended the very people—civilians in the Salvadoran countryside and civilian policymakers in Washington, D.C.—whom the ESAF needed on its side (Bacevich et al 1988: 25). Moreover, that the ESAF thought it necessary to brutalize the population just revealed how much legitimacy the Salvadoran government lacked, as its existence seemed to depend on brute force alone. “Only by respecting human rights, democracy, and reform,” wrote Benjamin Schwarz in his study for RAND, “could El Salvador’s military legitimize the regime it represented” (1991: 16). Without legitimacy, the Salvadoran government fueled the FLMN. A CIA interagency memorandum explained that ordinary Salvadorans were “as fearful of the government’s forces as of the insurgents. While a growing majority probably sees the government as a the lesser of two evils, widespread alienation and desperation in effect mark many as potential supporters of the of the insurgents” (CIA, 6/1981: 6).

Arnson and Schwarz elaborated this confluence of moral and strategic thinking. Arnson notes that the issue of human rights “embodied more than simply humanitarian motivations; it was implicitly and explicitly a way of viewing the underlying causes of instability.” This issue provided a “reminder to the United States that governments that mistreated their own citizens were unstable and thus potentially unreliable allies” (1989: 12-13). And Schwarz explains how “American advisers recognized that convincing the Salvadoran armed forces of the importance of winning popular support by respecting human rights was at least as crucial as improving the army tactically” (1991: vi). As both authors make clear, a foreign policy discourse saturated by human rights connected moral judgment and strategic calculation, especially in counterinsurgency, where winning over the population through benevolence had pragmatic benefits, such as depriving insurgents of material support and of willing recruits. Ultimately, this discourse highlighted how the U.S. mission in El Salvador would prove more difficult with human rights abusers as proxies. To advance U.S. interests, therefore, the ESAF had to undergo “fundamental” reform in its respect for human rights.

The U.S. emphasized the profundity of that reform because it characterized Salvadorans as profoundly flawed. For American observers, ESAF brutality represented a deep-seated symptom of Salvadoran society. Referencing longstanding stereotypes about “Latin American culture,” one State Department cable from January 1982 contextualized the “present crisis” by noting how “El Salvador has long been a country where violence is routine” (F5765). That cable summarized its findings by stating that, “the roots of violence here are not solely political; historical, sociological, and cultural factors are essential elements as well...El Salvador is a traditionally violent society” with a “violent cultural heritage” (F5772; F5769). A CIA report explained that, “violence is part of the cultural history of El Salvador” and “political violence has

occurred for generations.” Identifying the perpetrators of that violence, the report acknowledged that, “a large but unknowable percentage of the political violence in recent years has been carried out by rightwing civilian and military extremists” (F5624). In considering the prospects of building peace in El Salvador, the 1982 State Department cable predicted that only “gradual, not rapid, improvement” was possible. “Violence is too engrained in this society to expect more” (F5773).

Schwarz described why intervening in such a “violent and unjust” society, “one of the sickest and most repressive in Latin America,” would prove fruitless (1991: 71, v). In El Salvador, he explained, there was “a tendency toward schism and homicide verged on a national characteristic” (1991: 8). El Salvador suffered from “a most undemocratic culture” (1991: 71). By aligning itself with the repressive apparatus of that damaged country, the U.S. risked the “moral stain of galloping after security on the backs of *indigenous monsters*” (1991: 80, emphasis added). Perhaps to emphasize the enormity of those monsters, Schwarz offered a “slightly less repugnant alternative” to training and arming them. The U.S., he explained, could engage in overt imperialism and “occupy that country for as long as it takes to build democratic institutions” (1991: 80). Schwarz acknowledged the audacity of such a recommendation, but only to underscore the intractability of El Salvador’s societal problems and the inability of the U.S. to solve them indirectly.

From the U.S. perspective, such a society would naturally comprise people who condoned brutality and balked at human rights. As the CIA report explained, some Salvadorans “denounce the US ‘obsession’ with human rights and rationalize the need to fight leftwing terrorism with ‘whatever means necessary’ ” (F5626). And the ESAF seemed to embrace those very “means” in its fight against the FMLN. For example, a State Department cable from March

1982 stated that, “GOES [government of El Salvador] military and security forces rarely take captured insurgents prisoners. The implication has been that the Salvadoran soldiers do not surrender and conversely, military/security personnel regularly execute prisoners in the field” (F5751). Additionally, ESAF combat units lacked “fire control” (a euphemism denoting the ability to shoot with restraint and discrimination) and engaged in “arbitrary violence” when “unsupervised” (F5588; F5586). It was no surprise that such soldiers would resist notions of human rights. The State Department reported that Salvadoran military officers used a meeting with their American counterparts to “vent frustration over continued U.S. insistence that the armed forces take action against human rights abusers” (CIA, 1/25/84: 2).

The ESAF’s callous behavior toward enemy combatants revealed its disrespect for the rules of war; its callous behavior towards noncombatants, including American citizens, revealed a penchant for terrorizing the population. Three events involving civilians, in particular, garnered widespread media attention and intensified scrutiny of the Salvadoran proxies. They included the rape and murder of three U.S. nuns and a Catholic layworker by members of the Salvadoran National Guard in 1980; the murder of two American labor advisors a month later; and the killings of six Jesuit scholars, their cook, and her daughter in 1989 by members of the Salvadoran Army posing as FLMN guerrillas (Burgerman 2004: 272-272). The wanton killing of civilians raised doubts about command and control within the Salvadoran armed forces and about the capacity for the Salvadoran judicial system to deter soldiers from committing human rights violations (F5588). Could the U.S. rely on the ESAF high command to stem human rights abuse among its subordinates even if it wanted to? Could the U.S. count on the local judicial system to punish those crimes?

To make matters worse, Salvadoran military officers showed only a halfhearted desire to prosecute those high-profile cases and seemed unable to appreciate their gravity. A State Department cable from 1981 argued that the “dilatory investigations into the deaths of the four churchwomen and now the land reform advisers suggest strongly that the Salvadoran Armed Forces are still not willing to get tough with those who carry out the order of some kind of murder incorporated” (Robert White to Department of State, 1/16/81). And a State Department memorandum discussing the “Jesuit Case” explained that the “armed forces’ cooperation in the investigation has at times been less than satisfactory. Some military officers have provided sketchy or contradictory testimony and the absence of full cooperation by all military officers has raised questions about possible involvement beyond those currently indicted” (B. Aronson and J. Mullins to L. Eagleburger, 7/1991). In a study by a Congressional taskforce on the murders of Jesuit priests, Congressman John Moakley remarked on the coldness with which Salvadoran officers had responded to the murders; they appeared to grasp the strategic reasons behind avoiding human rights abuse, but not the moral reasons. “During its visit to Salvador,” Moakley recalled, “Task Force members heard the murders of the Jesuits described by high military officials as ‘stupid, ‘self-defeating,’ and ‘dumb’. But no senior military official with whom we talked said it was wrong.” These officers showed “a lack of outrage or moral condemnation” (1990: 10). The report ultimately called for “institutional reform within the Salvadoran military,” because “the military’s contribution to the problems of human rights and a paralyzed judicial system are not caused by a few renegade officers; they reside at the heart of the armed forces as an institution” (1990: 54).

Some of the worst human rights violations occurred outside the public’s view. They still elicited concern among U.S. policymakers, but in different ways. On one hand, the

institutionalization of the “human rights idea” heightened sensitivity to ESAF brutality among the American personnel who witnessed it, reported it, or saw reports of it. For instance, the author of a November 1981 cable from the U.S. embassy found it “particularly disturbing to have detailed [redacted] reports of Salvadoran Army massacres of women and children along the Rio Lempa and in Chalatenago. Indeed our own officials were witnesses to a machine gun attack on apparently unarmed civilians by helicopter” (F5826). Another cable from 1981 lamented that “a great deal of ammunition has been expended this year in the summary execution of many people merely suspected of sympathy with the Church or the Left, perhaps far less than the war supplies expended in legitimate battles with the armed insurgents” (R. White to Department of State, 1/16/81). And a cable from January 1982 explained that the “recently revealed (August 1981) and subsequently denied mass killing in Armenia emphasizes the gravity of the problem” in El Salvador (F5769).

On the other hand, some U.S. officials worried, not so much about the brutality itself, but about how it would affect public opinion and the purse strings in Congress. In the aftermath of the massacre at El Mozote in 1981, an atrocity in which the U.S.-trained Atlacatl battalion murdered 733 civilians, the Reagan Administration expressed concern about the extent to which, as propaganda for the enemy, such an atrocity jeopardized American backing for the ESAF and thus for the broader war effort. As Mark Danner reports, “to many in the Administration, the importance of the massacre *was* that it had such propaganda value, and that the propaganda, coming at a crucial time, posed a threat to American aid” (1993: 128, emphasis in original). But whether scrutiny of the ESAF dwelled on its brutality per se or on the potential of that brutality to cause a public relations crisis, it still represented a hurdle for U.S. policymakers to overcome.

Anxiety over the threat of public outrage just reaffirmed the illegitimacy of employing human rights abusers as security proxies.

Further adding to the ESAF's brutal character was its association with "death squads," extreme right-wing paramilitaries who pursued leftist insurgents often by way of murdering civilians. The inability of the ESAF to reign in soldiers who fought alongside these paramilitaries raised worries that the high command lacked control over its organization, or worse, that the high command condoned a tacit alliance with the paramilitaries. A CIA report on "right-wing violence" contextualized the ESAF-death squad connection by establishing the "rightist political tendencies running deep in the military" (F5626). Such tendencies drew the military closer to the paramilitaries, so that "rightist terrorism and violence" became "officially tolerated, if not sponsored" by the ESAF (F5832). In January 1982, a State Department cable declared that "in addition to civilians" manning the death squads, "both on and off-duty members of the security forces are participants" in them as well. "This was unofficially confirmed," the cable went on to say, "by right-wing spokesmen [sic] Maj. Robert D'Aubuisson who stated in an interview in early 1981 that security force members utilize the guise of the death squad when a potentially embarrassing or odious task needs to be performed" (F5770). Indeed, D'Aubuisson's enduring influence within the ESAF deepened its death squad connection. The CIA report, though heavily redacted, made clear that "former academy classmates and military colleagues of D'Aubuisson" occupied high positions within the ESAF hierarchy and "are alleged to have associations with rightwing terrorist organizations and, in some cases, to have been leaders of death squads within the Army and security forces" (F5630). In 1984, these findings became a concern of the Senate's Select Committee on Intelligence, which noted that, "significant political violence—including death squad activities—has been associated with elements of the Salvadoran security

establishment” (F5700). U.S. policymakers recognized how ESAF involvement in right-wing “terrorism” was widespread. Death squad participants came from “key units with strong political sway within the military institution” (5631). Outsourcing security responsibilities to the ESAF thus implied that the U.S. could also be outsourcing to death squads.

Countermeasures

The above subsection demonstrates how the U.S. saw ESAF brutality as a problem. In this subsection I outline the U.S.’s response to it. One State Department memorandum identified five options for the U.S. to consider. Each option represented a different degree of engagement with the ESAF and suggested a positive correlation between engaging with Salvadoran soldiers and leveraging them. While “suspend[ing] all security assistance and sales” would offer the “strongest action we can take to indicate USG [United States Government] disapproval of the performance and policies of the Salvadoran security forces,” it would also “relinquish almost all direct USG leverage through security assistance on the Salvadoran military to persuade them to improve their performance” (Department of State, 12/1/80). Similarly, while lifting all restrictions on military assistance would “increase military effectiveness of Salvadoran forces,” it would leave the U.S. with “no leverage over the military” (Department of State, 12/1/80). Thus to improve technical capabilities and to promote human rights reform, the U.S. struck a via media that fell within the framework already established by Congress. It would disburse military assistance, but with conditions attached; it would use its relationship with the ESAF to leverage the kinds of behaviors that aligned with its interests. From this perspective, the U.S.’s role as sponsor, trainer, and human rights promoter offered it the tools to effect the desired reforms.

Of course, the push to assist the ESAF reflected fears about ceding El Salvador to the communists (Danner 1993: 128). The key for the Reagan Administration was to re-link

anticommunism with human rights promotion. One Defense Department official captured this idea, noting that “the issue is no longer human rights but whether we’re heading toward another ‘Sandinista Nicaragua’ in El Salvador. If this happens, then there won’t be many human rights at all” (R. Komer to H. Brown, 1/8/81). And a Defense Department memorandum explained that “to withdraw our support” from El Salvador would “allow human rights violations to continue (or increase) under a different ideological umbrella—one which we cannot influence” (F5603).³¹ For the ardent Cold Warriors, outsourcing to the ESAF remained imperative, just as it had been imperative to enlist abusive Third World proxies in the past. But now, given the salience of human rights within foreign policy discourse, the U.S. made human rights promotion a feature of its security outsourcing. In fact, it justified that outsourcing as a means of engendering respect for human rights. The U.S. sought anti-communist proxies to fight on its behalf, certainly, but the institutionalization of human rights constructed an interest in employing humane proxies.

To pursue that interest, the U.S. used conditionality and socialization as agency slack countermeasures. Both reflected the specific agency costs of delegating security responsibilities to agents characterized as human rights abusers. The first, generated amid “public outcry mobilized by human rights NGOs,” came from Section 728(d) and (e) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981 (Burgerman 2004: 282). Drawing from the language of 502(b), this act mandated that the ESAF undergo a human rights “certification” process. The U.S. President would need to “biannually certify” that the ESAF had shown progress on respecting human rights as a condition for disbursing military assistance (ibid). To measure that progress, the State Department would evaluate whether the Salvadoran government

³¹ This logic was echoed by the academic Gabriel Marcella, who warned that cutting off military aid entirely to abusive governments “reduced U.S. access to the host country’s military, thus surrendering a capability to affect decisions made by the military which...thus perhaps contributed unwittingly to greater human rights violations” (1986: 99).

was: “Making a concerted and consistent effort to comply with internationally recognized human rights,” “Achieving substantial control over...its own armed forces,” “Making continued progress in implementing...the land reform program,” and showing a “good faith effort to investigate the murders [of the American churchwomen and labor advisors]...and bring to justice those responsible” (quoted in F5603). If the Salvadoran government showed progress in these areas, then the U.S. would distribute military aid to the ESAF. It was bribery for good behavior.

To impress upon the ESAF the significance of conditionality, the U.S. deployed high-profile political actors to El Salvador who could “stress the need for...restraint and support for human rights” (E. Corr to Department of State, 5/12/88). In December 1983, Vice President George H.W. Bush met directly with the ESAF high command. Six years later, Vice President Dan Quayle did the same. Instead of offering the usual diplomatic pleasantries and platitudes, both vice-presidents admonished the ESAF for its torpidity on human rights reform. In a striking manifestation of the U.S.’s transnational constitution of military power, Bush made clear to Salvadoran officers, to their faces, that their extant behavior jeopardized American funding and that Congressional scrutiny put the burden on them to improve their behavior (T. Pickering to Department of State, 12/11/83). He even provided the high command with a list of people linked to death squad activity and ordered those people exiled (Burgerman 2004: 288). A declassified State Department cable recounts a portion of Bush’s message:

Providing assistance to you is not a popular cause in the United States. Publicity about death squads, great inequalities of income, the killings of American citizens and military setbacks make it a very unpopular proposition in my country. President Reagan has supported you at considerable political cost, because we know it is the right thing...Without actions in these areas there is no point in trying to obtain additional funds for El Salvador, and to be honest, we will not even make the effort, because it would be fruitless (quoted in Burgerman 2004: 288)

This message is significant, not so much because it revealed “mixed signals,” but because it illustrated how human rights constrained U.S. foreign security development in El Salvador (Sikkink 2004). According to Burgerman, Bush’s visit showed how the “White House was not impervious to pressure from human rights activists and found it necessary to demonstrate its concern.” She argues that this “was probably the clearest single instance in which human rights pressure—initially generated by NGO lobbying, and then exerted by Congress on the administration, which then turned it on the Salvadoran government—resulted in some measurable action in El Salvador” (2004: 287).

Prompted by persistent frustration over ESAF behavior, Quayle’s visit in 1989 reemphasized Bush’s original message. The State Department had equipped Quayle with a “list of actions required to correct the military’s handling of a recent apparent human rights violation.” This list, which the U.S. ambassador eventually submitted to the Salvadorans, was prefaced by remarks such as, “Your failure to police yourself is now jeopardizing executive and Congressional support for continued assistance,” and the “ESAF must propose and institute an internal mechanism to investigate and punish effectively (formally or informally) officers guilty of human rights violations” (M. Levitsky to C. Lord, 2/1/89). The State Department also prepared a number of “private remarks” for Quayle to make among the Salvadoran officers. Some remarks praised the ESAF’s victories over the FLMN, but others reminded the ESAF of continued Congressional monitoring: “I can tell you from personal experience that the United States Congress monitors your commitment to human rights on the basis of your deeds, not words.” Another referenced the prior vice-presidential visit: “President Bush has a personal commitment to human rights and a personal state in your performance. He cannot tolerate any

backsliding from the commitment to progress you made to him” (M. Levitsky to C. Lord, 2/1/89).

To satisfy Congressional concern over ESAF impunity and the murders of American citizens, the U.S. sought reform of the Salvadoran justice system. Such reform offered the possibility of deterring future human rights abuse by making that system hold human rights abusers—even members of the armed forces—accountable for their crimes. The U.S. also sought justice for past abuse, particularly the murders of the American churchwomen and U.S. AID workers. And so, to “assist Salvadoran authorities to bring to justice those responsible for death squad activity,” the U.S. deployed advisory teams from the State Department and FBI, which “provided laboratory services and other technical assistance (including polygraph examinations)” (F5705; F5667). In his report on the murder of the churchwomen, Judge Harold R. Tyler “praised the FBI for being ‘vigorous and effective...in rendering critical investigative and technical assistance’ ” (quoted in F5667). Adding to the advisory effort, the U.S. also implemented the Administration of Justice Program for judicial training, a foreign assistance program that has since become one of the U.S.’s main “democracy-promotion policies” (Sikkink 2004: 171).

The second countermeasure aimed to “socialize” Salvadoran soldiers via the “civilizing” and “disciplining” influence of American training. This training took place in the United States, at the U.S.-run School of the Americas in Panama, and in El Salvador.³² U.S. officials argued that by professionalizing along American military standards, Salvadoran soldiers would learn the rules of war, the proper role of a military in a democracy, discipline, and respect for human rights (McClintock 1985: 70). A National Security Council memorandum from December 11,

³² Referencing the Draper Committee, the topic of the previous chapter, Schwarz notes that the “assumption that U.S. military assistance necessarily makes for a more humane and therefore more effective armed force in the host country is an old one” (1991: 16, footnote 34).

1980 stated that one “of the principal missions of our military trainers in El Salvador is to increase the professionalism of the armed forces and improve the system of military discipline and command and control, thus reducing the abuses suffered in the past by the civilian population at the hands of the armed forces” (NSC, 12/20/80; 2). The memorandum went on to say that, “sensitivity to the problem of military abuse of civilians has improved and should improve further through professional training programs, such as those we are instituting for officers and infantrymen in the United States” (ibid). In 1983, a State Department cable restated the need for “large doses of training” to make the ESAF an organization that “respects human rights, the rule of law and civilian government” (D. Hinton to Department of State, 5/11/83). Even when articulated in strategic terms, U.S. training served an uplifting purpose, one that would defeat the FLMN by humanizing ESAF units. For instance, one National Security Council memorandum from May 1981 explained the need to “facilitate training for these abuse-prone units to orient them toward civic action, psyops [psychological operations], rallier programs, and informational activity designed to win popular support and undermine guerrilla strength” (F5142).

Maintaining confidence in the counterinsurgency required the Reagan Administration to demonstrate the viability of socialization as a reform method. Through a “consistent public relations effort,” the administration worked to convince Congress and the public that training Salvadoran soldiers engendered humaneness, not just bellicosity, that such training had a “‘civilizing’ influence on the massacre-prone Salvadorans” and would teach “them to mend their ways” (McClintock 1985: 69-70). A February 1983 memorandum from the National Security Council described the “Public and Legislative Strategy” as one that would “Emphasize importance of fostering, through training, improvement in ESAF professionalism, to include

teaching the relevance of respect for laws and the populace; the importance of civic action; and the necessity of a comprehensive campaign to provide that security essential for political and economic progress” (F5321). Additionally, in a letter to Congress in October 1980, the White House explained that the “main component of our training assistance to the Salvadoran military is the ‘Code of Conduct’ course offered in Panama. With major human rights emphasis, this course introduces military personnel to professional techniques of discipline and command” (J. B. Atwood to M. McHugh, 10/22/80: 5). And a document listing frequent criticisms of U.S. military assistance and their corresponding rebuttals featured this criticism: “The army in El Salvador is reluctant to fight and is led by an officer corps working a nine-to-five shift.” According to the prepared rebuttal, White House officials were to explain that the “proposed military assistance emphasizes training which will help redress these shortcomings by increasing the number of disciplined soldiers with a thorough grounding in military arts and a sensitivity to the human rights of the population they defend” (F5261).

The White House even had to convince the Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, who in 1981 attempted to “keep the Military Training Teams out of country” (F5076, underlining in original). This alternate plan involved “train[ing] trainers outside of El Salvador instead of the Army directly.” To defend U.S. training in El Salvador, Major General Robert L. Schweitzer, the Director of the Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate, and Roger Fontaine, the head of the Latin American section of the NSC, employed the logic of socialization. They explained in a NSC memorandum that the “Presence of even a few small U.S. Training Teams...will have an uplifting psychological and morale effect. The moral significance of external support is the greatest single hope for any reversal” (F5076). Moreover, U.S. training would “also have an important disciplining effect on the Salvadoran troops. The sense of despair and fear when you

are in combat alone and losing sometimes leads to acts of brutality and even barbarism” (ibid, underlining in original).

Unrealized Countermeasures

Despite these countermeasures, which were in effect for more than a decade, the ESAF appeared decidedly unreformed by the late 1980s. Critics blamed this lack of reform on the unwillingness of the Reagan Administration to make military assistance truly conditional and on misplaced confidence in socialization as an agency slack countermeasure.

First, the Reagan Administration resisted and ultimately overrode the certification process. It realized that the certification requirement, if actually upheld, would eventually do what it was supposed to do: cut off military aid in the face of continued human rights violations. The prospect that the ESAF would lose American backing was difficult for the White House to countenance. One Department of Defense memorandum invoked the language of human rights to describe the dangers of occluding the aid spigot. “Such an act,” it declared, “would be devastating to our own national interests, the best interests of the Salvadoran people and, most of all, would most probably eradicate any serious possibility for establishing human, civil, and political rights for the foreseeable future.” Citing recent Latin American history, the memorandum explained that, “US security assistance was withdrawn from imperfect governments threatened by communist insurgency” twice before. “Both times the decision resulted in totalitarian dictatorships which have denied all forms of human rights to the people of Cuba and Nicaragua and offer no hope for their improvement” (F5599). The State Department shared this view, arguing that, “certification is a very ineffective way to achieve progress in human right issues in El Salvador (K. Dam, 1/17/84). While conceding that the “goals are proper,” the “State Department believes the certification process causes the Salvadoran

government to question the reliability of U.S. government support” (F5507). In November 1983, after only two years, Reagan used a pocket veto to kill the certification bill, though Congressional restrictions on military assistance managed to persist in different forms (Burgerman 2004: 283).

The notion that American trainers could socialize Salvadoran soldiers allowed the Reagan Administration to reject conditionality but still appear committed to human rights. If it occurred, socialization obviated the need for bribery. If the ESAF internalized the lessons of their American trainers, then they would respect human rights as a matter of course, on their own volition, not because they were forced into it. In this way, socialization buttressed the Reagan Administration’s justification for eschewing conditional military assistance.

ESAF behaviors, however, suggested to some critics that socialization had proven chimerical. While “U.S. officials have consistently stressed the importance of human rights compliance,” there was little evidence that the ESAF had internalized it (F5700). After all, the perpetrators of the El Mozote massacre, members of the “elite” Atlacatl Battalion, had received extensive training from the U.S. military. Even the ESAF’s positive behaviors were open to multiple interpretations. Colonel James J. Steele, the commander of U.S. operations in El Salvador from 1984 to 1986, expressed doubt about the true nature of reform within the ESAF: “If you look at this military and say, ‘Okay, have we really changed their attitude towards democracy, their role in the society, or have we just levered them into a behavioral change?’ The answer is, at this point, it’s too early to tell” (quoted in Cline 2006: 429).

By 1991, Schwarz had a more definitive answer: socialization had failed. As evidence, he pointed to the Jesuit murders, which occurred in 1989, after U.S. advisors had spent almost a

decade “socializing” the very battalion whose soldiers had carried out the crime. As Schwarz explains,

Believing that exposure to American ideas about human rights and democracy would have a positive effect on the military, advisers pinned their hopes upon the new generation of ‘professionalized’ officers, many of whom had been directly trained by the United States. Sadly, however, American training does not imply a lesson in civics; it is precisely the young, aggressive, U.S.-trained officers who are most intoxicated by the extreme right’s vision and most resentful of America’s influence over the conduct of the civil war, and who commit many of the worst atrocities (1991: vi-vii).

Even the progress that the ESAF showed struck Schwarz as hollow. “Respect for human rights appears to be not the result of American teaching or example,” he argued, “but of constant American pressure...This is a grim picture of our ally and pupil, for the military’s commitment to human rights is not very deep if that commitment is held in place by the trammel of American dollars” (1991: 36). Schwarz treated the convictions in the Jesuit case, for example, as the result of American pressure, not evidence of socialization. According to him, “Punishing human rights violators in El Salvador can be considered a significant and permanent advance only when it is *not* the result of urgent demands by the United States” (1991: 37, emphasis in original).

As Sikkink argues, this lack of reform within the ESAF thwarted reform within the Salvadoran judicial system. The military first had to subject itself to the law before such a system could even register among soldiers as a deterrent against atrocities. “Until the military stopped killing its opponents as a matter of policy,” Sikkink explains, “it hardly seemed important that the Salvadoran state also lacked the judicial and police capacity to carry out such investigations” (2004: 171). U.S. officials thus misunderstood the relationship between judicial and military reform in El Salvador. No amount of judicial reform could induce better observance of human rights within the military as long as it operated along a parallel judicial system as the de facto judge, jury, and executioner. Rather, a functioning system of law depended first on reforms

within the ESAF, as only a military that willingly existed within such a system, not above it, would allow it to work.

Ultimately, as a proxy force at the frontlines of anti-communism, the ESAF became indispensable to the U.S., despite its moral flaws and its inability to defeat the FLMN. The Reagan Administration needed Salvadoran soldiers as much as those soldiers needed American arms and training. And an agent whom the principal refuses to fire has few incentives to change what the principal finds repellent. ESAF leaders recognized that the Reagan Administration would sooner assist human-rights abusers—whom it could ostensibly pressure into human rights compliance over time—than allow a communist take-over (Schwarz 1991). The ESAF thus faced few actual costs for failing to undergo “fundamental” reform. Only once the Cold War ended did the U.S. finally make significant cuts to military aid. In 1990, in a push to settle the civil war, the U.S. reduced aid by 50 percent, making “the rest conditional on good faith in negotiations, acceptance of UN mediation, progress on the Jesuit case, and control of military violence against civilians” (Buergerman 2004: 283). By then, however, the ESAF had already committed numerous atrocities, no doubt facilitated by a decade of implicitly guaranteed assistance (ibid).

The U.S.’s enduring support for the ESAF does not, however, deny the constraints imposed by human rights concerns on their principal-agent relationship. The Reagan Administration expended time and energy that it would not have otherwise expended had those concerns been less salient within foreign policy discourse. Indeed, the Administration was cornered. To follow the rules of that discourse—which had just become institutionalized in law—it had to recognize that the abusiveness of Salvadoran proxies defined the specificity of the agency problem and the nature of the attendant agency costs. The White House could only justify

military aid to such proxies if doing so covered those costs—through either conditionality or socialization.

The poor implementation and quality of these countermeasures (highlighted for instance, by Schwarz’s RAND study) just intensified the urgency of human rights for future foreign security force development. In the 1990s, after the civil war in El Salvador had ended, the human rights agenda persisted, this time confronting the “War on Drugs” in Colombia.

Colombia: Human Rights and the “War on Drugs”

The U.S. recalibrated its national security strategy after the Cold War by militarizing its policy on illicit drugs. In 1989, President Bush implemented the Andean Initiative, a “five-year, \$2.2 billion plan” that disbursed “military and economic assistance to Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru” for the purpose of stemming the flow of “drugs at their source.” That same year, Congress passed the National Defense Authorization Act, which made the Defense Department responsible for the “detection of illicit narcotics shipments” coming to the U.S. Also in 1989, Bush “authorized \$65 million in emergency counternarcotics assistance for the Colombian armed forces and police” (Shifter and Stillerman 2004: 338-339). This reliance on military assistance revealed how the U.S., again unwilling to deploy its own combat troops abroad, was outsourcing security responsibilities to local forces. Like in El Salvador, that outsourcing brought with it the risk that the U.S. might be associating with human rights abusers.

In this section I focus on the Colombian armed forces (COLAR) as the main U.S. proxy in the War on Drugs. Like the ESAF, the COLAR’s record of abuse and of collaborating with right-wing paramilitaries excited worry among U.S. officials and human rights NGOs. In the early and mid-1990s, the U.S. responded to this worry by proposing policies borrowed from its

experience in El Salvador: certification (conditionality) and socialization. Again, the debate pivoted on whether the U.S. should terminate ties with human rights abusers or reform those abusers through continued engagement, particularly through training. Given the enduring currency of human rights within foreign policy discourse, both sides claimed legitimacy by treating human-rights promotion as their objective. But unlike in El Salvador, Congress eventually implemented an enhanced version of certification via screening that—contrary to the formulation in El Salvador—downgraded the role for socialization.

Colombia’s illicit drug trade has fueled, and has been fueled by, a tripartite internal conflict. This conflict involves two Marxist revolutionary groups, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and the National Liberation Army (ELN); right-wing paramilitaries, which in 1997 amalgamated into the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC); and the Colombian government. The FARC, ELN, and AUC have all derived funding from the drug trade, particularly by “‘taxing’ coca farmers and drug traffickers in exchange for protection” (Shifter and Stillerman 2004: 332). Colombia’s illicit economy has thus been at the center of its “long history of civil war and partisan bloodletting” (Doc. 2, 1/6/98). The dynamics of that conflict have complicated the U.S.’s reliance on the Colombian military for its counternarcotics campaign.

Specifically, the U.S. has worried that the COLAR would redirect assistance meant for counternarcotics to a counterinsurgency already fraught with human rights violations. Given its experience in El Salvador, the U.S. sought to avoid involvement in another counterinsurgency and to restrict military assistance to fighting the drug trade. It became apparent, however, that the U.S. could not ensure that military assistance would serve its intended ends. In 1991, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) warned that, “officials did not ‘have sufficient oversight to

provide assurances that aid is being used as intended for counternarcotics purposes and is not being used primarily against insurgents or being used to abuse human rights’ ”(quoted in Shifter and Stillerman 2004: 340). In 1993, the GAO repeated this concern, stating that the “State Department had not yet established end-use monitoring procedures to ensure that U.S. aid did not go to Colombian military units implicated in human rights violations” (Shifter and Stillerman 2004: 341). Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International pointed to this lack of oversight as a fundamental flaw in U.S. foreign security force development, one that allowed counternarcotics assistance to “be diverted to the killings fields” of the Colombian civil war (quoted in Shifter and Stillerman 2004: 340-342).

Responding to those concerns, the State Department emphasized that the U.S. would play no part in Colombia’s counterinsurgency. As the U.S. ambassador told the Colombian Minister of Defense in 1997, there “will be no USG [United States Government] assistance for fighting the guerrillas...*the issue raises too many human rights concerns and has been a searing experience for us in Central America*” (Doc. 51, 1/13/97: 7, emphasis added). Similarly, to mitigate Drug Czar Barry McCaffrey’s admission that counternarcotics and counterinsurgency intersected, the State Department emphasized this talking point: “We provide assistance to the Colombian National Police, and to those elements of the military which are directly involved in the counternarcotics efforts. We do not provide assistance to Colombia for counterinsurgency” (Doc. 57, 10/25/97). While McCaffrey was certainly correct in his assessment, given the links between the FARC and narco-trafficking, the official U.S. mission remained one of drug eradication and interdiction, not of arming and training the Colombian military to fight Marxist guerillas.

Wariness of counterinsurgency assistance stemmed from wariness of Colombia's military. Like the ESAF, the COLAR bore the stigma of human rights abuse. Since the early 1990s, when "human rights issues...assumed a much higher profile in the context of the U.S.-GOC [Government of Colombia] bilateral relationship," the U.S. had acknowledged the Colombian military's ruthlessness (M. Frechette to Department of State, 11/9/94). As one CIA report from 1994 explained, "Colombia's difficulty in correcting human rights abuses is likely to continue as long as the hardline strategy is in force...The Army traditionally has not taken guerrilla prisoners, and several recent brutal insurgent ambushes have not encouraged sensitivity to human rights practices" (CIA, 1/26/94: 7). That same report also discussed COLAR abuse of suspected guerilla sympathizers. Again, this struck the U.S. as bad counterinsurgency. The "military's continued harsh treatment—despite the new human rights code—of *campesinos* suspected of guerrilla sympathies perpetuates the hostility—or, at best divided loyalties—of the villagers, handicapping intelligence collection for counterinsurgent operations" (ibid: 4).

According to the State Department, perverse incentives within the COLAR had fostered a "body-count mentality," or, "syndrome" that had generated "false-positives," i.e., civilian deaths reported as guerilla casualties. As one cable explained, " 'body count' mentalities persist...Field commanders who cannot show track records of aggressive anti-guerrilla activity (wherein the majority of the military's human rights abuses occur) disadvantage themselves at promotion time" (M. Frechette to Department of State, 10/1994). Three years later, a State Department cable repeated this criticism, noting that there "is a 'body count syndrome' in the COLAR when it comes to pursuing the guerillas." This cable described an interview in which a high-ranking Colombian officer confirmed that this "mindset tends to fuel human rights abuses by otherwise well-meaning soldiers trying to get their quota to impress superiors." Worse still, it "could also

lead to a cavalier, or at least passive, approach when it comes to allowing the paramilitaries to serve as proxies for the COLAR in contributing to the guerrilla body count” (Department of Defense, 12/24/97: 3).

As the group responsible for the “bulk of political killings in Colombia,” the paramilitaries shared, if not surpassed, the COLAR’s institutional pathology. As a result, they further “complicated US interests in Colombia in the areas of human rights and counternarcotics” (Shifter and Stillerman 2004: 332; Doc. 53, 6/13/97: 2). In particular, the “paramilitaries’ victimization of growing numbers of innocent civilians runs counter to US interests in preventing human rights abuses in Colombia” (Doc. 53, 6/13/97: 15). According to the State Department’s Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the paramilitaries have shown a brazen disregard for human life by “liquidat[ing] suspected guerrillas and sympathizers without legal concerns” (Doc. 2, 1/6/98: 3). As a hindrance to the “twin US goals of advancing the peace process and improving the country’s poor human rights record,” and as an ugly reminder of the Salvadoran death squads, the paramilitaries found no place within U.S. counternarcotics policy (Doc. 64, 8/31/98: 2).

Rejecting the behavior of the paramilitaries proved easier in principle than in practice as long as the U.S. delegated security responsibilities to the COLAR. After all, both the COLAR and the AUC shared a common enemy and even served as official partners. From 1965 until 1989, the Colombian government had recognized and encouraged “self-defense groups,” offering them “military and police support” (Laurienti 2007: 72). In many ways, the military and paramilitary operated as parallel organizations, which showed in their similar approach to warfare. The CIA likened the COLAR’s tactics in its “counterinsurgency campaign” to “death squad tactics.” Like death squads, the “military has a history of assassinating leftwing civilians in

guerrilla areas, cooperation with narcotics-related paramilitary groups in attacks against suspected guerrilla sympathizers, and killing captured combatants.” In addition, several “Army officers were recently indicted for complicity in the massacre of 13 villagers in Rio Frio last October” (CIA, 1/26/94: 4).

Collusion on the battlefield between the COLAR and paramilitary groups appeared as inexorable as it was undesirable. The realization that both sides had reached an implicit truce excited “particular concern” among U.S. policymakers (Doc. 53, 6/13/97: 2). The Defense Department reported in 1997 that Colombian officers “never allowed themselves to become directly involved in encouraging or supporting paramilitary activities, but they turned their backs to what was happening and felt the COLAR should in no way be blamed for any resulting human rights atrocities committed” (Department of Defense, 12/24/97: 4). This struck the U.S. as a sign that Colombian soldiers tolerated the paramilitaries. As one CIA intelligence briefing reported, “We see scant indications that the military is making an effort to directly confront the paramilitary groups or to devote additional men or resources against them in an amount equal to the dimensions of the problem” (Doc. 53, 6/13/97: 2). And the State Department confirmed that “many officers turn a blind eye to paramilitary activities” (Doc. 2, 1/6/98: 3). A year later, the State Department reported that the COLAR had seemingly enabled the paramilitaries’ killing sprees: “Security forces did not intervene during 19 separate attacks in which 143 civilians were killed over four days in January” (Doc. 3, 1/25/99). Paramilitary killings continued unchecked through 1999, eliciting the ire of the U.S. Embassy: “The string of mass killings since May without security force response is appalling. How did seven massacres occur without interference under the noses of several hundred security force members?” (Doc. 5, 7/29/99).

Other reports highlighted the possibility of an implicit alliance between the military and paramilitaries. A Defense Intelligence Agency study explained that the “Colombian armed forces have not actively persecuted paramilitary group members because they see them as allies in the fight against the guerillas, their common enemy” (Doc. 4, 2/23/99). The CIA concurred: “local military commanders do not challenge paramilitary groups operating in their areas because they see the insurgents as the common foe” (Doc. 6, 9/16/99). The State Department even drew attention to the “appointment to key positions [in the COLAR] of several generals credibly alleged to have ties to paramilitaries” as evidence of informal linkages between the two groups (Doc. 3, 1/25/99).

Like in El Salvador, Colombia’s civil war blurred the distinction between regular and irregular armed forces. It was difficult, therefore, to employ regulars while at the same time keeping a distance from their irregular confederates. Such an alliance clarified the dubiousness of the COLAR as a security agent. Not only did it engage in human rights abuse, it also enabled the paramilitaries to do the same, but to an even greater degree. This compounded the danger that American military assistance to Colombia would perpetuate the very behaviors that U.S. foreign policy had come to proscribe.

Countermeasures

The U.S. government mitigated that agency cost by employing versions of the countermeasures it employed in El Salvador. Specifically, it implemented a more restrictive version of certification that made for a less transformative version of socialization. These policy changes came about in response to scrutiny from Congress and NGOs. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, in particular, became key interlocutors in the policy debate over foreign security force development in Colombia.

In 1994, the U.S. embassy in Bogotá laid out an agenda for ensuring that its counternarcotics proxies observed human rights. This agenda included the familiar method of providing “human rights educational training to selected police and military personnel.” The Embassy sought to “raise the profile of USG human rights policies through U.S.-sponsored educational and training initiatives and exposure to U.S. human rights issues and practices.” In addition, “DoD security assistance training programs are required to include a component of human rights training” and that the “expanded IMET program also has a considerable commitment to offering human rights” (M. Frechette to Department of State, 11/9/94: 2-3). The potential to engender human rights awareness via training again gave the executive a basis on which to justify continued engagement with morally suspect proxies. From this perspective, cutting all aid eliminated a means of influence, not to mention the proxies’ invaluable services.

The State Department stood ready to deploy this argument against its critics. The agenda from 1994 had noted the importance of “keep[ing] the Washington interagency community informed on human rights developments, both positive and negative, in order to deal more effectively with U.S. Congressional and NGO interlocutors” (M. Frechette to Department of State, 11/9/94: 7). In November 1996, the State Department attempted to “deal with” Amnesty International, which had publicized damning evidence of U.S. assistance to COLAR units implicated in human rights violations. A cable from the ambassador rejected Amnesty’s interpretation of that evidence. It went on to argue that the “U.S. government and its military have worked tirelessly to promote awareness and respect for human rights by the Colombian military as well as to report and denounce human rights violations whenever and wherever they occur, regardless of who commits them.” In describing an upcoming meeting with representatives from Amnesty International, the ambassador lamented the extant distrust between

human rights NGOs and government officials. “That is not the way we would prefer to relate to the NGO community,” he explained, “but for now, apparently, that is the way we will have to play the game” (M. Frechette to Department of Justice, 11/27/96).

The embassy attempted to “deal with” another NGO interlocutor the following month when it rebutted a report by Human Rights Watch. This rebuttal was not originally meant for public release; it was instead a classified internal communication between the Embassy and State Department. In it, embassy officials addressed each of the report’s points and criticized HRW for failing to appreciate the leverage afforded by continued engagement: “HRW is correct that the USG has a responsibility to take steps to minimize human rights violations wherever possible...To totally disengage from our relationship with the COLAR, however, would eliminate the leverage we have to bring about improvements” (M. Frechette to Department of Justice, 12/11/96: 4). The Embassy explained that engagement allowed the U.S. to hold Colombian officials accountable for their military’s abuses. For instance, should “there be credible evidence to indicate that COLAR units were diverting U.S. military assistance program equipment to paramilitary groups, it would be grounds for serious and tangible remonstrations with the GOC” (M. Frechette to Department of Justice, 12/11/96: 9).

Embassy officials specifically invoked American military training in attacking HRW’s position. They maintained that integrating such training into counternarcotics assistance allowed the U.S. to weaken narco-traffickers while promoting human rights: “USG military training has in the past provided one of the most comprehensive human rights resources available to the GOC. All training of Colombian military and police forces, as a matter of policy, includes a substantial human rights component in the curriculum” (M. Frechette to Department of Justice, 12/11/96: 4). The response later acknowledged that the Colombian military

should be instructed in the laws of land warfare, the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of prisoners of war, and respect for basic human rights, just as their U.S. counterparts are. Indeed, Colombian military and police personnel receive this kind of training. Ironically, HRW recommendations made elsewhere to completely suspend such training opportunities would eliminate this human rights training as well (M. Frechette to Department of Justice, 12/11/96: 11).

These embassy officials expressed particular frustration at HRW’s “guilt by association” argument. They resisted the notion that training human rights abusers rendered the U.S. an accessory to their abuses, especially when that training prioritized human rights. Indeed, from this perspective, the COLAR committed human rights abuse *despite* U.S. training, not because of it. As the U.S. Ambassador noted, “HRW spokesperson Jamie Fellner told the press on November 25, ‘We don’t have any evidence that the intention of the United States was to aid human rights violations, but that has been the effect.’ Of course HRW doesn’t have any evidence—it’s totally preposterous that we would knowingly aid and abet human rights violations” (M. Frechette to Department of State, 12/4/96: 18). Rather, an extensive human rights training program held the promise of socializing the COLAR into improved behavior.

At the same time, the Embassy’s 1994 agenda also contained the germ of a challenge to socialization as an agency slack countermeasure, one that Congress would later exploit. While the agenda had proposed socialization via training, it had also proposed “combating impunity for violators by screening out violators from U.S.-sponsored training” and “conducting aggressive human rights end-use monitoring [EUM] of supported units” (M. Frechette to Department of State, 11/9/94: 2). These new initiatives grew from the anxiety of sponsoring counternarcotics operations amid a counterinsurgency. Were the recipients of arms and training collaborating with paramilitaries or actively violating human rights? Would military assistance be redirected to counterinsurgency instead of being used for counternarcotics? Delegating responsibilities only to Colombian soldiers with clean records mitigated the risk that they would misuse their training

and arms. And the “exclusion of candidates from coveted U.S. training spots on human rights grounds...[would send] a clear message to the Colombian armed forces that human rights violations will not be overlooked or tacitly accepted (M. Frechette to Department of State, 11/9/94: 4-5). In principal-agent theory, screening generally refers to selecting agents whose interests already align with those of the principal. In this particular instance, the U.S. would screen its agents to find only those who were either not prone to human rights abuse or who could be dissuaded from engaging in it. Such vetting enhanced human rights conditionality on military assistance to the Colombian military.

When it was revealed that the U.S. had given military assistance to human rights abusers in 1994, “despite the Clinton Administration’s assurances to the contrary,” Congress seized on this idea of vetting Colombian military units by passing the Leahy Law, also called the Leahy Provision or Amendment (Amnesty 2001: 26). In 1996, the U.S. had already decertified the Colombian government, which meant that it had “suspended all aid” to the Colombian military but continued counternarcotics aid to the Colombian police (Shifter and Stillerman 2004: 344). During that same year, Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) (one of the “Watergate babies”) proposed legislation that reopened the door to engagement with individual military units, but only if those units avoided human rights abuse and any association with paramilitaries. This legislation, which Congress passed as part of the 1997 Foreign Aid Spending Bill, prohibited counternarcotics assistance to:

any unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights, unless the Secretary determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the government of such country is taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces unit to justice (quoted in HRW 2001: appendix 3).

In 1998, the law grew to cover “all programs funded under the Foreign Operations Act,” not just counternarcotics aid. And in fiscal year 1999, the Leahy requirements extended to all training included in Department of Defense appropriations (War 2002: 2). At the end of 1998, the Defense Department submitted detailed instructions to “theater CINCS [commanders in chief] and services” so that they would come in “compl[iance] with the new Congressionally directed requirements concerning human rights verification for all DoD-funded training of foreign security forces.” According to this cable, the U.S. military had “to ensure that foreign security forces whom US forces intend to train are appropriately reviewed for gross violations of human rights prior to training” (Doc. 65, 1/25/00: 1-2).

The language of the Leahy Law also defined the U.S.’s 1997 “End-Use Monitoring” [EUM] agreement with the Colombian military. While this agreement limited military aid to counternarcotics only, it also subjected individual COLAR units to human rights vetting as a prerequisite for aid disbursement (War 2002: 3). This put the burden on the U.S. Embassy to work with the Colombian government in finding units without human rights abusers. As one cable explained, the “embassy is required to obtain certification from the [Colombian] ministry that no unit nominated to receive U.S. assistance contains any person against whom charges have been formally opened but not pursued under the Colombian Justice System” (M. Frechette to Department of State, 9/4/97). Another cable discussed how enforcing the EUM was an arduous process of “determin[ing] which of the six army units can receive aid immediately, which can receive aid based upon the Secretary of State’s certification to Congress under the Leahy Law, and which units have human rights concerns such that U.S. aid is out of the question” (Doc. 58, 1/15/98: 6).

The law even managed to survive “Plan Colombia,” the \$1.3 billion assistance package that the Clinton Administration approved in 2000. While the Administration cited a “drug emergency” to circumvent several of the human rights restrictions put into the plan by Congress, it still faced Leahy Law requirements, which could not be waived. As discussed below, the 12th and 24th brigades of the COLAR lost access to U.S. assistance because of their tarnished records while Plan Colombia was in effect (War 2002: 4). And in 2002, Leahy and Senator Ted Kennedy sent a letter to the Secretary of State reminding him of the State Department’s continuing obligation to vet prospective recipients of military aid. To facilitate the vetting process, the Senators listed six Colombian generals and four Army brigades known to have ties with paramilitaries (T. Kennedy and P. Leahy to C. Powell, 3/7/2002).

Signaling the depth of the Colombian military’s problems, few of its units actually qualified for military assistance when the new requirements took effect (Sikkink 2004: 200). The National Security Archive reports that of “the six units first vetted under the new EUM agreement, four were turned down on human rights grounds” (War 2002: 3). In addition, new evidence kept mounting that units once thought to be untarnished were actually implicated in abuse. In 2000, the U.S. discovered that the Colombian Army’s 24th Brigade, together with the 31st Counter guerrilla Battalion, might have been involved in “several human rights crimes, including the execution of three campesinos detained at a roadblock” and “cooperating with illegal paramilitary groups” (War 2002: 20; Doc. 70, 7/5/00: 3). In response, the State Department equipped the U.S. Ambassador for his meeting with the Colombian Minister of Defense with these talking points: First, the “USG takes these allegations very seriously, and cannot provide assistance to the 24th brigade until the investigation is completed, and then only if that investigation is thorough and either disproves the allegations or recommends appropriate

sanctions for those involved.” And second, “we urge to take strong and rapid action to ensure that the 24th brigade and its members remain free of all ties to illegal paramilitary groups. This brigade is vital to the success of counternarcotics operations in the region, but any taint arising from association with illegal paramilitary groups will make it impossible for the USGO to provide support” (Doc. 70, 7/5/00).

The inability of so many COLAR units to meet the Leahy Law requirements led State Department officials to propose a measure that had been off the policy menu since 1934—developing new, “clean,” military units from scratch. In 1998, a State Department cable posed the question, “What is the possibility/likelihood of creating new COLAR units to receive aid?” (Doc. 63, 8/26/98: 10). The U.S. Ambassador broached this idea with Defense Minister Lloreda in a meeting that same year. According to the cable recounting their meeting, the ambassador “outlined for minister Lloreda’s understanding our detailed EUM vetting procedures, raised the possibility of standing up new, clean units, and emphasized that the GOC needs to start taking ‘effective measures’ to bring human rights abusers to justice” (C. Kamman to Department of State, 10/16/98: 31). The ambassador explained that the “raising of ‘new’ units made up of pre-screened troops untainted by human rights abuses” would satisfy “Leahy Amendment standards” (C. Kamman to Department of State, 10/16/98: 33). The U.S. realized this idea by the end of 1999, when a “bilateral working group of U.S. and Colombian defense officials” formed “a counternarcotics battalion staffed by the Colombian army and equipped and trained by the United States” (Sikkink 2004: 200). This initiative eventually grew to “three 1,000-man counternarcotics battalions.” As the National Security Archive reports, these new battalions “were deployed under the operational control of JTF-S [Joint Task Force South],” the “U.S.

supported-supported command element operating in Colombia's southern coca growing regions" (War 2002: 3).

The Leahy Law marked a watershed in U.S. foreign security force development for a number of reasons. First, it applied human rights conditionality at the micro level. A unit became flagged if it contained just one member implicated in human rights abuse. That kind of scrutiny had not existed before. Second, the Leahy Law acknowledged that, contrary to the Embassy's critique of the HRW report, the U.S. could in fact become guilty by association. In this way, one of HRW's main criticisms found expression in policy. As Leahy stated before the Senate in 1998:

A country is judged, in part, by the company it keeps. By failing to establish a clear, transparent and comprehensive policy that governs all our military training programs and adequately takes into account human rights considerations, the United States, and our soldiers, will continue to be implicated in the atrocities of those we train" (Congressional Record – Senate 1998: S5658).

By restricting assistance to those foreign military proxies whose behavior conformed to professed American values, the Leahy law formalized the rule prohibiting association with inhumane proxies. It acknowledged that to engage with human rights abusers was to become an accomplice to that abuse. Third, the law challenged socialization as a viable reform method. By screening out those who actually needed human rights socialization, it evacuated U.S. training of its erstwhile transformative purpose. The goal was no longer to inculcate human rights awareness, but to reward that awareness when it preexisted exposure to American training. Like Schwarz's critique of U.S. policy in El Salvador, the Leahy Law rejected the conventional notion that mere exposure to American culture would endow foreign soldiers with a new respect for human rights. Instead, the law used the threat of disengagement to deter human rights abuse

among prospective aid recipients. Within the Leahy law, conditionality surpassed socialization as the dominant agency slack countermeasure.

The Leahy Law remains, however, an imperfect countermeasure to inhumane military proxies. After all, it relies on the accuracy of the information available on foreign military units. An embassy's unwillingness or inability to scrutinize foreign military personnel would undermine the law's certification procedure and thus weaken it as a deterrent against human rights abuse. This problem of implementation continues to energize the debate over the problem of human rights within FSF development.

School of the Americas Watch confronts the "School of the Assassins"

School of the Americas Watch (SOAW) represents the most recent and prominent effort to cast doubt on foreign soldiers—specifically those from Latin America—as acceptable military proxies of the United States. Since the early 1990s, this grassroots protest movement has campaigned against the School of the Americas (SOA), a U.S. military training center at Fort Benning, Georgia that in 2001 became the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC). While SOAW deploys the same arguments leveled by other human rights advocates, it extends those arguments in new ways. First, it supports conditionality on military assistance, but only to highlight laxness within the SOA's screening process. The failure of SOA to exclude every human rights abuser has given SOAW a justification to call for the school's closing. Second, SOAW agrees that U.S. training is ineffective at socializing foreign soldiers to respect human rights, but not because it considers socialization a failure. Rather, it suggests that Latin American soldiers have trampled human rights because their socialization at SOA/WHINSEC was a *success*. From this perspective, the school deserves to be shut down, not

only because it allows in human rights abusers, but because it also teaches abuse. The U.S. government has responded by exploiting SOAW's confidence in socialization. To refute the notion that WHINSEC "trains to torture," the government has turned WHINSEC into a showpiece of human rights instruction.

Since the beginning, SOAW has taken a dual approach to its activism. Given that it pursues a concrete objective—closing SOA/WHINSEC—SOAW often operates as a shrewd, pragmatic organization. As such, SOAW has penetrated the corridors of Congress, forged alliances with politicians—including James McGovern (D-MA), John Lewis (D-GA), Joseph Moakley, Robert Kennedy (D-MA), and Denis Kucinich (D-OH)—and continued to lobby other prospective Congressional allies. Since 2010, SOAW has begun holding annual meetings in Washington, D.C., where it collects input from its membership, formulates its legislative campaign, and organizes meetings with members of Congress. SOAW has even expanded the targets of its lobbying. While it knows that its message on human rights resonates with liberal Democrats, it also thinks that its stand against unnecessary and destructive foreign aid could appeal to conservative Republicans (Interview 2).

Brokering ties with legislators has given SOAW a means of closing SOA/WHINSEC through conditionality, the countermeasure with which Congress has the most experience. Through information provided by the United Nations Truth Commission report on El Salvador and through the Freedom of Information Act, SOAW has exposed the SOA's record of training human rights abusers. Indeed, many of the infamous personnel discussed in this chapter attended the SOA, including the Salvadoran death squad leader, Major Roberto D'Abuisson; members of the Atlatl Battalion, which carried out the massacre at El Mozote; 19 of the 27 Salvadoran soldiers implicated in the 1989 Jesuit murders; and "more than 100 Colombian military officers

alleged to have been responsible for human rights violations” (Grimmett and Sullivan 2001:3). These findings reveal the failure of the SOA to restrict itself to only those foreign troops who respect human rights. Whether such a failure has resulted from ineffective screening or willful neglect, it still has the effect of associating the U.S. with undesirable personnel. As Joseph Kennedy explained, the SOA “ends up giving the imprimatur to these types of human rights abusers. It gives the impression that America has somehow blessed this kind of activity” (quoted in Sikkink 2004: 202). To condemn that activity, Kennedy and other Congressional allies have proposed multiple pieces of legislation throughout the 1990s and 2000s that would either cut the school’s funding or close it altogether. While Congress has yet to pass a bill that would close the school, it did pass a bill in 1997 that required the Secretaries of Defense and State to certify the implementation of “specific guidelines governing the selection and screening of candidates at the School of the Americas” (Grimmett and Sullivan 2001: 11).

To bolster this legislative strategy, SOAW has pushed for and secured the release of the names of SOA/WHINSEC trainees. Congress ratified amendments to the House Defense Authorization Act of 2009 that required the disclosure of the “names, country origin, rank and dates and classes attended at the SOA/WHINSEC for graduates and instructors.” In October 2009, President Obama “signed the language, with conditions, into law” (“The Top 10 List” 2009). SOAW has posted those names on its website so that anyone can compare them with known human rights abusers from Latin American militaries. Publicizing the identities of these soldiers democratizes the vetting process. Rather than relying on embassy officials to investigate the recipients of U.S. military aid, ordinary citizens can now scrutinize for themselves the recipients of American arm and training, at least those who attended SOA/WHINSEC. And more vetting enhances the ability of SOAW to expose more trainees as human rights violators. Such

exposure would further paint SOA/WHINSEC as an institution lacking the capacity or will to deter human rights abuse among Latin American militaries. Through these “names amendments,” SOAW seeks to collect all the information available that would demonstrate how SOA/WHINSEC has—knowingly or unknowingly—sabotaged conditionality as an agency slack countermeasure.

The other side of SOAW’s activism relies on conspiratorial views towards U.S. foreign policy. From this angle, the U.S. government does not just acquiesce to brutal proxies by letting them participate in training; it actively inculcates their brutality by encouraging them to carry out coups and to repress their populations. According to SOAW protests, the U.S. has exploited Latin American soldiers as instruments of its “empire.” This argument—which denies an agency problem because it assumes that FSF agents do what the U.S. principal tells them to do—became a fixture of SOAW activism after a scandal involving SOA training manuals used between 1982 and 1991. In 1996, at the urging of Joseph Kennedy and the *Baltimore Sun*, the Pentagon declassified materials that included instructions for how to gather intelligence by threatening “fear, payment of bounties for enemy dead, beatings, false imprisonment, executions, and the use of truth serum” (quoted in Sikkink 2004: 203). SOAW can rightly point to these manuals as evidence that the SOA has indeed taught torture, among other vile techniques (Haugaard 1997).

The scandal over the manuals presented policymakers with a relic from an era when the risk of human rights abuse was not the salient agency cost of employing foreign military proxies.³³ This relic flouted the current discursive rule that condemns human rights abuse by security proxies. Showing how “civil society and congressional human rights pressures can contribute to the implementation of human rights policy even in the most resistant and

³³As Haugaard notes that the “manuals do indeed appear to be older material that was inconsistently updated...in some manuals there are references that do not seem to have been updated since the 1960s” (1997: 2).

autonomous spheres of the U.S. government,” policymakers quickly reaffirmed that rule (Sikkink 2004: 203). The Pentagon’s follow-up report denounced the materials as obsolete artifacts of the “Army’s Foreign Intelligence Assistance Program” from the 1960s. The report stated that SOA instructors had failed to receive “doctrinal approval” before using them (quoted in Sikkink 2004: 203). While the Pentagon never punished those who had developed and used this inhumane curriculum, it did destroy copies of the manuals and warn “governments in Latin America that the manuals contained passages that did not represent U.S. policy” (ibid). To further ensure that the SOA curriculum aligned with proper policy, Congress passed legislation in 1997 that increased oversight of SOA activities. To receive IMET funding, the Secretary of Defense would now have to certify that, “the instruction and training provided by the School of the Americas was ‘fully consistent with training and doctrine, particularly with respect to the observance of human rights’ ” (quoted in Grimmett and Sullivan 2001: 10). Enhanced congressional scrutiny, not to mention the public scrutiny generated by SOAW, has all but eliminated the capacity of SOA/WHINSEC to teach the kinds of techniques found in those manuals.

And yet, the annual protests outside the gates of Fort Benning still maintain that WHINSEC trains to torture, to assassinate, and to plot coups. These protests further contend that the trainees are receptive to such training. At the 2009 protest, for example, speakers attributed the 2008 “coup” in Honduras to the training of two Honduran generals at SOA. One speaker described the Honduran people who have suffered from the resulting social unrest as “victims of the School” [of the Americas]. According the protest slogans, SOA/WHINSEC has both opened its doors to preexisting human rights abusers and continues to fashion new instruments of abuse.

The conspiratorial side of SOAW's activism has wedded it to hyperbolic claims that are difficult to prove and easy to refute. SOAW has thus sought evidence to substantiate the notion that attendance at SOAW/WHINSEC increases an attendee's propensity to abuse human rights. While Lesley Gill affirms this causal link in her ethnography of the SOA (2004), only one piece of research, an article by Katherine McCoy adapted from her master's thesis, tests it with event history analysis. On the surface, this article appears to confirm SOAW's claims. McCoy concludes that "students who took multiple courses at the school are more than three times more likely to violate human rights than their counterparts who took only one course" (2005: 61). But Ruth Blakeley finds serious flaws in that conclusion, flaws that even SOAW staff members acknowledge.³⁴ The legislative coordinator told Blakeley that McCoy's article "is not our strongest lobby tool." And the founder of SOAW, Roy Bourgeois, admitted to Blakeley that he "never mentioned it or used it in my talks" (2006: 1447).

SOAW members have also backtracked on the claim that WHINSEC teaches torture or other repressive techniques. One prominent staff member was "unsure" when I asked whether WHINSEC taught torture (Interview 2). In his interview with Blakeley, Bourgeois was more forthright, admitting that torture training does *not* in fact occur at WHINSEC (2006: 1445).

Several researchers challenge SOAW's claim that U.S. FSF development engenders illiberal values, but they never question that such development *does* engender some set of values. Tomislav Ruby and Douglas Gibler take as their "null hypothesis" the "conventional wisdom" that U.S. professional military education (like the kind that takes place at SOA/WHINSEC) is

³⁴ One of the main problems with McCoy's research is that "of the 11,797 SOA graduates within her dataset, there are allegations against 153 of them, which amounts to 1.3%" of those in the sample. More importantly, these are only allegations. Of the 153 accused, only 9 have actually been convicted. Problems of impunity notwithstanding, a 6% conviction rate among the already small number coded as human rights abusers means that, according to McCoy's own data, the vast majority of SOA graduates have committed no abuse (Blakeley 2005: 1446-1447). It is difficult to reconcile that with the notion that SOA-WHINSEC "trains to torture."

“associated with the worst possible abuse practices in foreign militaries” (2010: 10). By begging the question—i.e., presuming that socialization towards abusiveness is the default phenomenon rather than a phenomenon yet to be confirmed—Ruby and Gibler clear an easy path to rejecting the null hypothesis.³⁵ They conclude that, “professional military education of foreign officers does lead to increased stability abroad” (2010: 2). Similarly, Carol Atkinson dismisses the “popular notions” that “U.S. professional military training education programs supported negative socialization in the sense of promoting authoritarian political institutions” (2005: 533, 532). Instead, she finds “U.S. military engagement activities to be positively and systematically associated with liberalizing trends” (2006: 510).

Though scholars disagree with SOAW’s specific claims, they implicitly agree with its larger message: American military training socializes foreign trainees. As a result, socialization has been reinvigorated as a rhetorical resource in debates over FSF development. By insisting on the transformative potential of U.S. military training, both SOAW and its critics accept the efficacy of socialization, a countermeasure once considered dubious. This represents a significant historical achievement, given that socialization lost credibility following the intervention in El Salvador and the implementation of Leahy Law requirements. Now, the question is no longer, does the training have an effect, but rather, which effect does it have? As Atkinson explains, “both sides of the argument hold that socialization takes place; but differ over the direction of that influence: toward more authoritarian or more liberal practices” (2006: 511). This view concedes that training *can* socialize foreign troops in ways that serve U.S. interests, whatever they may be. To invalidate the claim that SOA/WHINSEC “trains to torture,” therefore, the U.S. government needed only to change the training so that it prioritized human

³⁵ A far more realistic null-hypothesis would be that U.S. military training for foreign troops has no socialization effect.

rights. If, as SOAW has argued, SOA/WHINSEC could train foreign soldiers to violate human rights, then it could also presumably train those soldiers to respect them. And U.S. government officials are certainly happy to point to scholarship that confirms this newfound respect.³⁶

The U.S. government thus outflanked and co-opted the conspiratorial understanding of SOA by redesigning the school and reopening it under a new name in 2001. According to its defenders, WHINSEC, unlike its predecessor, promotes the *right* kind of socialization. And WHINSEC welcomes scrutiny of its curriculum by inviting protesters, journalists, and academics to sit in on its classes, attend field trips, and speak to its instructors and trainees. After several weeks at WHINSEC, Blakeley reported that it is “transparent and subject to external oversight,” and that it “has the most highly developed human rights programme of all U.S. military training.” She goes on to say that

WHINSEC’s charter requires that all courses, which last 12 weeks, provide a minimum of eight hours mandatory instruction on human rights, the rule of law, due process, civilian control of the military, and the role of the military in democratic society. WHINSEC is the only US military institution where human rights instruction is incorporated into every course...Much of the human rights training I observed was of a high standard (2006: 1445)

I spent a week observing similar classes over the summer of 2008. My experiences confirm Blakely’s account.

What Blakeley and I witnessed was a concerted public relations effort, of course, but to legitimize itself, WHINSEC obviously seeks public consent. In the end, I am less interested in the human rights instruction itself than in how such instruction has come to represent an effective approach to mitigating the risk of abusive military proxies. I attribute that development in part to SOAW’s protest message, which has resuscitated socialization as a rhetorical resource in policy debates and even set the terms of the academic debate. Socialization remains a given, while the

³⁶ Indeed, the public relations official at WHINSEC was eager to tell me about Blakeley’s research.

direction of that socialization becomes the key variable. By admitting the U.S. government's capability to socialize foreign military proxies, SOAW and its critics have enabled WHINSEC to legitimize its human rights instruction as a viable agency slack countermeasure.

Conclusion

Conditionality and socialization represent distinct moves within a game whose main rule prohibits complicity in human rights abuse. Because of "Congressional activism" and the incorporation of voices from civil society into foreign policy debates, U.S. FSF development has found itself at the center of that game since the 1980s. Players from the executive, Congress, and civil society have sought countermeasures to ensure that foreign military proxies do not abuse human rights. Conditionality and socialization have offered two such countermeasures, each with its own logic. The former incentivizes respect for human rights; the latter engenders it. Their differing approaches to mitigating the risk of abuse have fueled debate over which is more effective. An alliance between members of Congress and NGOs has tended to favor conditionality. The executive has tended to prefer socialization. The game has required both sides to legitimize their preferred move with reference to how well it covers the agency costs of employing abusive agents.

Unlike the previous three chapters, this chapter features intense contestation among the principal's constitutive actors. But such contestation was less about how to *define* the agency problem and its attendant agency costs than about how to *cover* those costs. An alliance between members of Congress and NGOs managed to corner its critics into conceding that any association with inhumane military proxies was bad policy. This does not mean that those critics had personal epiphanies, but rather that they accepted as legitimate this particular definition of

the agency problem. Whereas fears over racial inferiority, partisanship, and nationalism structured U.S. policy towards foreign security force development in the past, worries about human rights abuse have structured that development since the late 1970s—even though certain U.S. officials appear unsympathetic to those worries. I maintain this conceptual equivalence because the risk of human rights abuse, like the three risks discussed in previous chapters, has become the agency cost du jour of outsourcing military responsibilities to foreigners. Its legitimacy does not depend on private belief, but rather on public consent, which it currently enjoys. Of course, the U.S. will still occasionally contradict this human rights policy, but when it does, it can expect backlash for breaking the rule of the game. Witness, for example, the public outcry against the recent U.S. decision to send military assistance to Egypt's military junta. After all, to contradict this rule is to remind everyone that there was something there to be contradicted in the first place.

The question now becomes: how, if at all, will actors redefine the social basis of the agency problem within the internationalization of U.S. military manpower? What will be the next set of salient agency costs in the War on Terrorism?

Conclusion:

U.S. Security Outsourcing: Past, Present, and Future

This dissertation made a wager at the onset: that we can generate new insights into the international relationship between the United States and its foreign security proxies if we apprehend that relationship through the analytical lens of domestic civil-military relations. This wager has paid out in two ways. First, the contentiousness of that relationship comes into focus. Just as a president remains vigilant in preventing her military from “shirking” its responsibilities, or worse, taking political power for itself (Feaver 1996, 2003; Quinlivan 1999), the U.S. foreign-policy establishment has confronted the risk that foreign proxies could hinder its strategic objectives rather than advance them. This contentiousness highlights an international analogue to the principal-agent problem normally associated with domestic civil-military relations. Treating the U.S. as the principal and FSF as its agents recovers the contingency, doubt, and anxiety that functionalist studies like Gill’s (2004) and Atkinson’s (2006) eclipse. From the perspective of the principal, the agent is “guileful” and unreliable, a potential problem, not, as those studies and others like them imply, a readymade solution. While the literature has dwelled on whether delegating security responsibilities to foreigners serves a democratizing/state-building mission or something more sinister, they have so far failed to address the more fundamental question—agonized over by the policymakers themselves—of how *foreign* troops could be made to serve *American* security interests in the first place. My aim in this study has been to address that question.

Second, the limitations of the conventional principal-agent framework itself come into focus. Explaining the variation in agency slack countermeasures over the past century requires

more than positing an a priori preference divergence between the principal and agent. Instead of taking a generic conflict of preferences as the starting point, we need to unearth the social basis of that conflict. What exactly about the agent strikes the principal as worrisome? To avoid tautology, that question deserves an empirical, not a priori, answer. It calls for adopting the perspective of the principal—embedded in its historical context—as it evaluates its agents. This methodological commitment to the “double hermeneutic” follows logically from the principal’s role as mitigator of the agency problem (Giddens 1987). The principal is left to draw upon its social milieu when identifying the “types” of agents with which it is dealing. Establishing their respective types then defines the specific sources of their misbehavior. Such knowledge production enables the principal to customize its strategies accordingly. Ultimately, constructivist principal-agent theory allows for a creative and adaptive principal, one that both defines the agency costs at hand and covers them as it sees fit. This theory both reveals and explains historical change in the principal-agent relationship as the principal’s perspective on that relationship evolves over time.

My study has shown that the U.S. has invoked the alterity of its foreign security proxies when evaluating them as agents. Their varying signs of otherness have defined which agency costs are incurred by outsourcing responsibilities to them. At different periods, the U.S. has labeled foreign troops as racially inferior, partisan, nationalist/underdeveloped, or illiberal. Each label has suggested a particular set of difficulties for the principal to manage. The risk of racially inferior FSF proving too childlike or savage to be of service on the battlefield, for example, posed a different danger than the risk of partisan FSF exploiting American arms and equipment for political gain, of nationalist FSF rejecting the imperialist implications of American military assistance, or of illiberal FSF funneling that assistance towards human rights abuse. Different

dangers called for different sets of responses, from placing American officers in command of FSF units, to bribing foreign governments, to socializing foreign military officers. Thus when the dominant characterization shifted from one to the other—a process that followed the discursive evolution within U.S. foreign policy more generally—so too did both the calculation of agency costs and the implementation of strategies for covering them. Viewed together, the preceding empirical chapters trace the principal’s changing definition of the FSF agency problem over the past century and the corresponding variation in agency slack countermeasures. And while the same countermeasures were at times proposed to address different agency costs—e.g., using American officers to corral racial savagery *and* prevent politicization—policymakers had to explain and justify the capacity of one countermeasure to tighten multiple sources of slack.

Conventional agency theory treats the preference divergence between principal and agent as exogenous and a priori, while constructivist agency theory treats that divergence as endogenous and empirical, an analytical move that foregrounds the social basis of the principal-agent problem. Isolating that basis generates the potential for new insights into agency problems familiar to political science—from how voters hold their representatives accountable to how governments monitor their delegates to international organizations (Miller 2005; Hawkins et al. 2006). By linking a principal’s understanding of its agent to its design of agency slack countermeasures, constructivist principal-agent theory shows why a principal would implement only certain countermeasures from among all those available. It is a theory of choice, but one grounded in the reasons given for that choice by the principals themselves (Davidson 1963). Preserving principals’ agency in this way means that their individual choices cannot be predicted *ex ante* (if discourse *x* then policy *y*). Rather, they can only be explained as “actually experienced situations” with reference to a menu of choices that a dominant discourse made

available (Jackson 2011: 144). Ultimately, this sociological innovation of agency theory explains variation in the U.S.'s use of foreign security proxies while offering a useful toolkit for the broader study of authority delegation.

My application of constructivist principal-agent theory has centered on the principal's constitutive actors, not the interactions between the principal and agent. As I discuss in chapter 2, this approach reflects the failure of the principal-agent relationship to qualify as intersubjective as constructivists have understood the term (Barkin 2010). But that failure comes from analytical restrictions, not empirical ones. Like its conventional version, constructivist principal-agent theory is an ideal-type. It necessarily ignores some empirical complexity for the sake of analytical coherence. While I pushed conventional agency theory to recognize how the social basis of the agency problem captures an important feature of the agency relationship, I paid little attention to the ways in which agents manipulate their principals.

Future research could thus push agency theory to also assume the perspective of the agent, to examine its understanding of the principal, and to see how it responds to its subordinate status. Why does the agent choose to work for the principal? Why does it comply with the principal's orders? What "weapons of the weak" does it employ when it wants to circumvent those orders (Scott 1985)? How, in other words, does it counter the countermeasures? These questions draw our attention to the agent's interests, creativity, adaptability, and capacity for resistance. I touched on this briefly in chapter 4 when I discussed the unintended consequences of creating a monopoly of force in countries where no such monopoly had existed before. Opportunistic agents seized political power by controlling that monopoly once the American occupation ended. Additional research could investigate this phenomenon in greater depth and breadth by exploring how foreign troops' own strategic objectives were hindered, advanced, or

redefined through their involvement in the U.S. FSF development. Such an analytical move would recognize the agency of agents and thus redefine them as both objects and subjects. As a result, it would open constructivist principal-agent theory to examining intersubjective processes of interaction between principals and agents, not just among the actors who constitute the principal.

Internationalizing U.S. Military Manpower Over the 20th Century

The historical evolution of U.S. FSF development reveals several trends. First, there has been a move away from overt hierarchy between the U.S. and its foreign security proxies. This move follows the transition from formal to informal empire, from an old imperialism exerted by the metropole to a “new imperialism” exerted through globalization and a network of ostensibly sovereign states (Wendt and Friedheim 1995; Wood 2003). American officers no longer command FSF units under the command of proconsuls, the U.S. has fully outsourced the officer positions to foreigners, and it has eschewed exclusive political authority over occupied countries. On the surface level, this means that since the end of World War II, foreign proxies have become “allies” who serve their sovereign countries, not just the U.S. And when these “partners” happen to engage in missions the completion of which would advance American interests, they do so because their own governments chose to cooperate, not because their governments had little choice in the matter. At least that is the official line.

Informal hierarchy is still hierarchy, however. It just manifests in subtle forms or away from public view. For instance, the Draper Committee developed indirect means of establishing a transnational organization of military power despite the formal sovereignty of the countries whose militaries that organization comprised. The notion, inspired by modernization theory, that

foreign officers could be socialized into serving American interests represented indirect control par excellence, as it promised to turn those officers into self-governing, reliable agents without the need for material inducements or constant monitoring. An insidious form of “soft power,” this countermeasure reinforces hierarchy by aiming to get *others* to want what *you* want, which assumes that your wants, not those of others, deserve hegemonic status (Nye 2004). But it also shrouds that hierarchy by presenting agents as volitional actors whose experiences with their principal lead them to willfully share their principal’s interests.

Also, when Vice-Presidents Bush and Quayle met face-to-face with members of the Salvadoran high command behind closed doors and ordered them to end human rights abuse, there was no mistaking the inequity of status between the U.S. and El Salvador. The latter was to conform to the interests of the latter, not vice versa. Of course, the failure of the high command to obey those orders clarified the challenges—so well articulated by Benjamin Schwarz’s sardonic suggestion that the U.S. return to formal empire (1991)—of influencing foreign militaries within an international system organized around state sovereignty. That the U.S. helped to found this post-World War II system has only compounded those challenges. The U.S. remains vulnerable to criticisms that arming and training foreign troops violates the principles of sovereignty it supposedly champions. In recent years, Latin American states like Venezuela, Argentina, Uruguay, and Bolivia have protested this informal American empire by bucking the internationalization of its coercive apparatus. For instance, they have de-linked their militaries from the U.S. Southern Command (the combatant command responsible for Latin America) by forbidding their military personnel from attending WHINSEC.³⁷

³⁷ As of this writing, SOAW is now lobbying Ecuador to follow suit.

Second, the principal's constitutive actors have grown to include civil society actors, but only recently. Certainly, non-governmental groups, such as the American Anti-Imperialist League, were deeply involved in foreign policy debates in the past. And there has always been an academic and journalistic interest in how local soldiers could facilitate foreign interventions. *The Nation*, for example, published critiques of the American occupation of Haiti between 1915 and 1934. And yet, *The Nation* never questioned the use of the gendarmerie per se, only the ends to which the gendarmes were put. While those critiques stirred debate about the moral costs of imperialism, they said little about the strategic dangers of relying on foreigners to advance American objectives. Debating that policy remained the province of the State Department, Congress, and military. Only within the last thirty years has that policy become the explicit target of non-governmental advocacy organizations. Once NGOs like Amnesty International made alliances with members of Congress in the 1970s, civil society became a major actor in debates over security outsourcing. Those NGOs then set the stage for School of the Americas Watch, the most vocal critic of FSF development today. SOAW began its advocacy in the early 1990s outside the normal political channels—i.e., through direct action, illegal protests at the site of School of the Americas. Since then, however, it has complemented those protests by soliciting Congressional allies and pursuing its advocacy agenda through legislative action.

And yet, this broader range of actors constituting the principal probably means less for evaluating agents than some would expect. While Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, School of the Americas Watch, and others catalyzed and guided a shift in FSF discourse, that shift could have only been possible if the foreign policy establishment was already open to arguments articulated in human rights terms. Constructivist principal-agent theory maintains that the principal's constitutive actors define the agency problem through an intersubjective process.

Such a process requires its participants to speak and understand a common language. To make themselves meaningful, the participants must follow a shared set of rules. There would have been an incommensurability problem had civil society actors spoken a language that was foreign to members of Congress and the executive. Admittedly, these advocates faced resistance and had to frame human rights as both morally and strategically significant to make their agenda resonate within the foreign policy establishment. But to find that framing persuasive required preexisting understandings of the relationship between human rights and foreign policy. And as Sikkink points out, such understandings *had* existed within the foreign policy mainstream, ever since the drive to create a human rights regime after World War II (2004). While harsh anti-communism eventually displaced those understandings, it did not quash them. They remained dormant, ready to be revived by actors who could reactivate this common human rights language.

The discourses described in the empirical chapters—scientific racism, progressivism, decolonization/modernization, and human rights—were widespread across American society. As a counterfactual, consider the likely effect of the Anti-Imperialist League contributing to the policy debates over FSF development. Given the ubiquity of racism across the political spectrum, it seems unlikely that those who opposed imperialism would have characterized Filipino or Haitian security forces differently than did the soldiers and statesmen who favored it. After all, many anti-imperialists justified their position by rejecting the “backward” peoples that an empire would bring into the U.S.’s orbit (Jacobson 2000: 230-234). Like members of the foreign policy establishment, these members of civil society recognized scientific racism as legitimate. To qualify as dominant, a discourse must enjoy currency among groups that might disagree over policy. Such a discourse transcends the political cleavages that mark a given historical context while delimiting the range of possible contestation. While it provides rhetorical

resources rich in meaning, it remains circumscribed by silences—what Hopf calls the “non-reflective side of social order” and what Reus-Smit calls “metavalues” (2010: 540; 1999: 15). Indeed, scientific racism left little room for doubting racial hierarchy, progressivism never challenged the benefits of nonpartisan efficiency, decolonization took formal empire off the table, modernization invoked scientific authority to “objectively” evaluate foreign officers, and few American officials today question (at least in public) the validity of human rights.

Thus constructivist principal agent theory casts doubt on whether widening the political or ideological spectrum of the principal’s constitutive membership at a given point in time would fundamentally alter its approach to defining the principal-agent problem. While the policies proposed to mitigate a particular definition of that problem might differ—as the debate between conditionality and socialization from the previous chapter highlights—those policies would still be still aimed at covering the same set of agency costs. Without alternative discourses to compete directly with the dominant discourses of FSF development, there was little contestation over how to calculate agency costs in each of the four discursive clusters.³⁸

Third, Latin America figures prominently in the historical arc of U.S. FSF development. Since the early 20th century, following the Spanish-American War and Roosevelt’s Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, Latin American security forces have come under the umbrella of American hegemony. As a result, they represent longstanding links in its transnational network of military manpower and have been marked by each definition of the FSF agency problem. Racial hierarchy shaped FSF development in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Progressivism shaped that development in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. Modernization’s reliance on

³⁸ While scientific racism did exist concurrently with progressivism, these two discourses did not offer competing, rival interpretations of FSF. As the U.S. experience in the Dominican Republic showed, those discourses could in fact prove complementary. A good example of competing discourses comes from Klotz’s discussion of Apartheid South Africa, where the international human rights regime confronted notions of national self-determination (1995).

military officers as political actors informed American support for military coups in Guatemala, Uruguay, Chile, Brazil, and Argentina. And the hazards of human rights abuse defined relations with the Salvadoran armed forces in the 1980s and continue to define relations with the Colombian military today.

The role of Latin American soldiers in American grand strategy has reflected the changing uncertainties of an evolving principal-agent relationship. But that role has also become more integrated into the American military apparatus. During my visit to WHINSEC, for example, I witnessed Colombian instructors giving lectures to American soldiers who had opted to take their professional military education courses in Spanish, alongside their Latin American counterparts. These Colombians, having many years of experience with combating drug cartels, provided the kind of specialized knowledge in drug interdiction and eradication that American military personnel lacked. Outsourcing security responsibilities means more than getting others to fight your wars; it means exploiting the knowledge of foreign soldiers to improve your application of strategy. The use of Latin American instructors at WHINSEC represents a highly institutionalized form of that knowledge sharing.

Finally, applying constructivist principal-agent theory to more than a century of American foreign relations history reveals an unlikely “family resemblance” among the four clusters of policy debates and their respective discourses (Wittgenstein 2009). From this perspective, scientific racism, progressivism, decolonization/modernization, and human rights all serve a similar function. As meta-narratives, they all made certain rhetorical resources available within debates over security outsourcing. In this way, they substantiated the controversies over entrusting foreign soldiers with executing American foreign policy. Because the human rights

regime still enjoys currency, it seems out of place next to de-legitimized discourses, particularly scientific racism, which is antithetical to advocacy groups like SOAW.

This study resists the temptation, however, to treat human rights as the triumph of the right discourse over its wrong predecessors. Instead, it views human rights as critically as it views easy targets like racism or modernization. Like its predecessors, the human rights regime creates an Other—specifically, one that fails to reflect the standards that the Self values. For my purposes, the validity of human rights standards is less important than the role they play in the Self-other relationship. Roxanne Doty’s work on imperialism draws attention to this role (1996). She warns against rationalizing foreign interventions through human rights rhetoric. Doing so, she argues, reproduces a Self-other hierarchy and gives license to use human rights as a cudgel against those considered illiberal. Similarly, the language of human rights reproduces agents as problematic, defines the salient agency costs, and evokes anxiety within the principal. For some, this anxiety justifies the termination of arms and equipment to actual or suspected human rights abusers. For others, it justifies military training programs that aim to replace brutality with liberal values. We can normatively approve of this anxiety while still acknowledging its lineage to fears that were once inspired by a foreign agent’s racial inferiority, partisanship, and nationalism/underdevelopment. Analytical symmetry among the four discourses need not suggest normative equivalence.

Contemporary U.S. FSF Development and Prospects for the Future

When the Egyptian Military refused to fire into crowds of anti-Mubarak protesters last year, American officials were quick to point out that the soldiers were showing themselves the product of their American training. Egypt has long been a major recipient of U.S. military aid,

which has included not just weapons and vehicles but also professional military education. It was this education, argued American officials, that socialized Egyptian soldiers into respecting the human rights of the protesters, even to the point of refusing orders from their civilian superiors. The U.S. treated this behavior as a success story of an FSF development program designed to instill liberal values within historically illiberal peoples. Before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General James Mattis “attributed the ethical behavior of the Egyptian military to the time they spent in US military war colleges” (Mulrine 2011). And Jim Fain, director of the international military student division at the Command and General Staff College of Fort Leavenworth, explained that the “restraint and professionalism that's being demonstrated by their military is based on something...I have to believe that their behavior is somewhat informed by their experiences here” (quoted in *ibid*). Over a year later, as the Egyptian military perpetuates its political rule as the “interim” government, engages in arbitrary arrests, and infringes on human rights, talk of socialization has faded and military aid to Egypt has come under increased scrutiny for not including enough human rights conditionality. And so, the debate over conditionality and socialization described in the previous chapter persists. We are still living in an era when the threat of human rights abuse defines the salient agency costs of delegating security responsibilities to foreign soldiers.

The question now becomes: will the War on Terrorism change how the U.S. understands its prospective security proxies? Just as in past military campaigns, the War on Terrorism seeks to make use of foreign soldiers where American soldiers would otherwise have to fight. Current military assistance to Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, Yemen, Ethiopia, Indonesia, and the Philippines demonstrates this global effort to enlist local forces in counter-terrorist campaigns (Kaplan 2005). Nowhere is this strategy more evident than in Afghanistan, where after more than a

decade American success hinges on the performance of the Afghan National Army and National Police. Eager to draw down its own soldiers, the U.S. has placed the future of Afghanistan in the hands of this security apparatus, a fighting force raised, trained, and armed by American soldiers and funded by American taxpayers. The U.S. is eager to outsource the Afghan campaign to the Afghans.

As expected, the Afghan security forces are anything but a readymade solution to the problem of defeating the Taliban, ending the insurgency, and preventing al-Qaeda's return. Incompetence remains a persistent challenge. As one American soldier explained, Afghan troops "are stoned all the time; some even while on patrol with us... They are pretty much gutless in combat; we do most of the fighting" (quoted in Rosenberg 2012). Worse, these forces have undermined any trust NATO might have in their loyalty. NATO trainers worry that the Taliban has infiltrated the ranks, that those ranks already comprise Taliban sympathizers, and that Afghan soldiers simply resent a foreign occupation. Their worry stems from an especially pernicious agency cost: the possibility that they have been arming and training their terrorist enemies. The murder of 57 NATO service members since 2011 has underscored that cost and has frayed confidence in the Afghan trainees (Kasprzak 2012). NATO has even developed a euphemism—"green on blue," as opposed to "blue on blue," which refers to friendly fire—to classify attacks from supposedly allied soldiers. And as Matthew Rosenberg of the *New York Times* reported in January of 2012, a leaked coalition report entitled "A Crisis of Trust and Cultural Incompatibility" noted that American soldiers ranked their Afghan counterparts very low on several categories, including "trustworthiness on patrol" and "honesty and integrity" (2012). The report further highlighted American worries that Afghan security forces were "in league with the Taliban" (ibid).

What remains to be seen, and what should become apparent as more coalition reports become public, is how NATO evaluates and responds to the threat of these green on blue attacks. After all, given the total number of coalition troops (120,000) and Afghan security personnel (350,000) in the field, NATO could very well treat these attacks as isolated, not systemic, and dismiss them. But if they continue, or become more frequent, could they match the significance of past threats posed by racial savagery, partisanship, nationalism, or human rights abuse? Or will NATO define the agency problem of using Afghan security forces differently? How will concerns over human rights abuse make their way into the development of those forces? Future research is needed to address these questions.

References

Primary Sources

Archives

Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas. U.S. President's Committee to Study the United States Military Assistance Program (Draper Committee): Records, 1958-59).

National Archives, College Park, Maryland. See web archive:
http://www.flickr.com/photos/rittinger_archive-research/sets/72157627600336206/

National Security Archive, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Body Count Mentalities: Colombia's 'False Positives' Scandal, Declassified. January 7, 2009. National Security Archive.

<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB266/index.htm>

CIA, 1/26/94. "Colombian Counterinsurgency: Steps in the Right Direction." Office of African and Latin American Analysis

Myles Frechette to Department of State, 10/1994, U.S. Embassy Bogotá cable.

Department of Defense, 12/24/97, "Cashiered Colonel Talks Freely About the Army He Left Behind."

Paramilitaries as Proxies. October 16, 2005. National Security Archive.

<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB166/index.htm>

Document 2, 1/6/98. *Colombia: A Violent Backdrop*. State Department, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Intelligence Assessment.

Document 3, 1/25/99. *Official Informal for Ambassador Kamman From WHA/AND Director Chicola and DRL DAS Gerson*, State Department cable.

Document 4, 2/23/1999. *FARC Guerilla Commander and Paramilitary Group Members Comment on Their Organizations and Activities*, Defense Intelligence Agency, Intelligence Information Report.

Document 5, 7/29/99. *Paramilitaries Massacre as Many as 50 in Norte de Santander*. U.S. Embassy Bogotá, cable.

Document 6, 9/16/99. *[Armed Groups Filling Power Vacuum in Rural Areas]*, CIA, Senior Executive Intelligence Brief.

War in Colombia: Guerrillas, Drugs and Human Rights in U.S. Colombia Policy, 1988-2002, Vol. III, Conditioning Security Assistance. Michael Evans, ed. May 3, 2002. National Security Archive. <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB69/>

Document 51, 1/13/97. U.S. Embassy Bogotá cable, “Ambassador’s January 12 Meeting with New MOD Designate.”

Document 53, 6/13/97. Central Intelligence Agency, Intelligence Report, “Colombia Paramilitaries Gaining Strength.”

Document 57, 10/25/97. State Department cable, “Clarification of U.S. Counternarcotics Assistance.”

Document 58, 1/15/98. U.S. Embassy Colombia cable, “Colombia EUM Update: Embassy Lights a Fire Under MOD.”

Document 63, 8/26/98. U.S. Embassy Colombia cable, “Military Assistance to Colombian Army’s 7th and 12th Brigades, and 2nd ‘Brim.’ ”

Document 64, 8/31/98. Central Intelligence Agency, Intelligence Report, “Colombia: Paramilitaries Assuming a Higher Profile.”

Document 65, 1/25/00. U.S. Embassy Colombia cable, “EUM Agreement: Signed, Sealed, and Delivered.”

Document 70, 7/5/00. State Department cable, “Approach to MOD on 24th Brigade.”

The Digital National Security Archive

El Salvador: The Making of U.S. Policy, 1977-1984

<http://nsarchive.chadwyck.com.libezproxy2.syr.edu/collections/content/ES/intro.jsp>

Brian Atwood to Matthew McHugh, 10/22/80, Department of State, no. ES00822

Deane Hinton to Department of State, 5/11/83, U.S. Embassy, no. ES03993

El Salvador: War, Peace, and Human Rights, 1980-1994

<http://nsarchive.chadwyck.com.libezproxy2.syr.edu/collections/content/EL/intro.jsp>

Bernard Arronson and Janet Mullins to Lawrence Eagleburger, 7/1991, Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs and Bureau of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, no. EL01293

Department of State, 12/1/80, no. ES00894

NSC, 12/10/80, Special Coordination Committee, no. EL01362

Robert Komer to Harold Brown, 1/8/81, Department of Defense, Under Secretary for Policy, no. EL00380

Robert White to U.S. Department of State, 1/16/81, no. EL00698

CIA, 6/1981, no. EL00064

Thomas Pickering to Department of State, 12/11/83, no. EL00813

Kenneth Dam, 1/17/84, Department of State, no. EL00819

CIA, 1/25/84, no. EL00119

Edwin Corr to Department of State, 5/12/88, no. EL00954

Melvyn Levitsky to Carnes Lord, 2/1/89, Department of State, no. EL00990

Colombia and the United States: Political Violence, Narcotics, and Human Rights, 1948-2010

<http://nsarchive.chadwyck.com.libezproxy2.syr.edu/collections/content/CD/intro.jsp>

Myles Frechette to Department of State, 11/9/94, no. CD00890

Myles Frechette to Departments of Justice and State, 11/27/96, no. CD01052.

Myles Frechette to Department of Justice, 12/11/96, no. CD0163.

Myles Frechette to Department of State, 12/4/1996, no. CD01057.

Myles Frechette to Department of State, 9/4/97, no. CD01171.

Curtis Kamman to Department of State, 10/16/98, no. CD01350.

Edward Kennedy and Patrick Leahy to Colin Powell, 3/7/02, no. CD01881.

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, Simi Valley, California. See web archive:

http://www.flickr.com/photos/rittinger_archive-research/collections/72157627695033409/

U.S. Army Military History Institute, Carlisle, Pennsylvania. See web archive:

http://www.flickr.com/photos/rittinger_archive-research/sets/72157627476521629/

Memoirs

Munro, Dana G. 1974. *The United States and the Caribbean Republics 1921-1933*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stimson, Henry L. 1927. *American Policy in Nicaragua*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons

Wise, May. 1929. *A Marine Tells it to You*. New York: J.H. Sears & Company.

Journals/Periodicals/Newspaper Articles/Monographs

Army and Navy Journal. June 10, 1905. "Philippine Constabulary a Failure." 1115.

Bacevich, A.J., James D. Hallums, Richard H. White, and Thomas F. Young. 1988. *American Military Policy in Small Wars: The Case of El Salvador*. Washington, D.C.: Pergamon-Brassey's.

Barber, Willard F. and Neale Ronning. 1966. *Internal Security and Military Power: Counterinsurgency and Civic Action in Latin America*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press

Bienen, Henry. 1971. "The Background to Contemporary Study of Militaries and Modernization," in *The Military and Modernization*, Henry Bienen, ed. Chicago: Aldeine-Atherton.

Denig, Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. 1932. "Native Officer Corps, Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua." *Marine Corps Gazette* 17: 75-77.

Denny, Harold Norman. 1928. "Nicaragua's New Army a Curb on Revolutions." *The New York Times*, March 4.

Douglas, Paul H. 1927. The American Occupation of Haiti II. *Political Science Quarterly*. 42 (3): 368-396.

Fellowes, Edward A. 1923. Training Native Troops in Santo Domingo. *The Marine Corps Gazette* 8 (4): 215-233

Hanna, Matthew. 1904. "The Necessity of Increasing the Efficiency of the Cuban Army." *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States* 35: 28-36.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Political Order and Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Keyser, Major Ralph Stover. 1926. "Constabularies for Central America." *Marines Corps Gazette* 11: 87-97.

Lobingier, Charles Sumner. 1910. The Peacekeepers in the Philippines. *The American Review*

- of Reviews*. 42: 310-314.
- “Military Assistance Training.” 1971. Report of Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments to Committee on Foreign Affairs. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Munro, J.N. 1905. The Philippine Native Scouts. *Journal of the United States Infantry Association*. 2 (1): 178-190.
- The *New York Times*. 1900. “New Filipino Horse: Four Troops of Macabebes to be Formed with Americans as Officers.” July 17th, pg. 10.
- The *New York Times*. 1901. “Native Troops in the Philippines.” December 1st.
- The *New York Times*. 1901. “Plan for Filipino Troops: Secretary Root Expects to Raise the Full Quota of 12,000—Great Care in Selecting Men.” April 21st, pg. 3.
- Pauker, Guy J. 1959. “Southeast Asia as a Problem Area in the Next Decade.” *World Politics* 11(3): 325-345.
- Powell, W.H. 1900. Some Random Notes on the Fighting in the Philippines. *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States*. 27 (108): 317-340.
- Pye, Lucian W. 1962. “Armies in the Process of Political Modernization.” In *The Role of The Military in Underdeveloped Countries*, ed. John J. Johnson. 69-89. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rostow, W.W. 1961. “Guerilla Warfare in the Underdeveloped Areas.” *Department of State Bulletin* 233 (45): 233-238.
- Seaman, Louis Livingston. 1900. Native Troops for our Colonial Possessions. *North American Review*. 171 (529): 847-860.
- Schwarz, Benjamin C. 1991. *American Counterinsurgency Doctrine and El Salvador: The Frustrations of Reform and Illusions of Nation Building*. Santa Monica: RAND.
- Smith, Major Julian C. et al. 1974. *Nicaragua: A Review of the Organization and Operations of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Marine Corps Headquarters.
- Ward, John W. 1902. The Use of Native Troops in Our New Possessions. *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States*. 31: 793-805.
- Williams, Charles F. 1918. La Guardia Nacional Dominicana. *The Marine Corps Gazette*. 3 (3): 194-199.

Willis, Henry Parker. 1905. *Our Philippine Problem: A Study of American Colonial Policy*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Windle, Charles and T.R. Vallance. 1962. "Optimizing Military Assistance Training." *World Politics* 15(1): 91-107.

Wood, Leonard. 1899. "The Existing Conditions and Needs in Cuba." *The North American Review*. 168 (510): 593-601.

Congressional Documents

U.S. Congress. *Congressional Record-Senate*. 1901. Washington, DC.

U.S. Congress. Senate. 1901. *Reports of the Taft Philippine Commission*. 56th Cong., 2nd sess. S. Doc. 112. Serial 4040.

U.S. Congress. Senate. 1902. Committee on the Philippines. *Affairs in the Philippines Islands: Hearings before the Committee on the Philippines*. 57th Congress, 1st sess., Doc. 331. Serial 4242.

U.S. Congress. Senate. 1908. Committee on Military Affairs. *Office of Captain in the Philippine Scouts*. 60th Congress, 1st sess., Report no. 176, February 6.

U.S. Congress. Senate. 1922. Select Committee on Haiti Santo Domingo. *Inquiry Into Occupation and Administration of Haiti and Santo Domingo*. Vols. I & II. 67th Congress, 1st & 2nd sess.

U.S. Congress. House. 1928. Committee on Military Affairs. *Philippine Constabulary: Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on Military Affairs*. 70th Congress, 1st sess., February 27.

U.S. Congress. Senate. 1928. Committee on Foreign Relations. *Use of the United States Navy in Nicaragua*. 17th Congress, 1st session. S. Res. 137.

U.S. Congress. House. 1976. Committee on International Relations. *International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976*, 94th Congress, 2nd sess., Report No. 94-1144.

U.S. Congress. *Congressional Record-Senate*. June 4, 1998. S5658.

FRUS (Foreign Relations of the U.S.). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office

21 July 1917. "The Annual Report of the Military Government of Santo Domingo up to end of fiscal year, June 30, 1917."

- 14 February 1929. Vol. III. The Minister in Nicaragua (Eberhardt) to the Secretary of State.
- 16 February 1929. Vol. III: 617. The Secretary of State to the Minister in Nicaragua (Eberhardt).
- 30 March 1929. Vol. III. The Minister in Nicaragua (Eberhardt) to the Secretary of State.
- 29 May 1929. Vol. III. The Secretary of State to the Chargé in Nicaragua (Hanna).
- 9 November 1929. Vol. III. The Secretary of State to the Chargé in Nicaragua (Hanna).
- 14 January 1931. Vol. II. The Minister in Nicaragua (Hanna) to the Secretary of State.
- 17 March 1931. Vol. II. Hanna to the Secretary of State.
- 16 November 1931. Vol. V. Matthews to the American Chargé.
- 25 November 1931. Vol. II. The Secretary of State to the Chargé in Nicaragua (Beaulac).
- 19 July 1932. Vol. V. The Secretary of State to the Minister in Nicaragua (Hanna).
- 8 August 1932. Vol. V. The Jefe Director of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua (Matthews) to the American Minister (Hanna).
- 16 August 1932. Vol. V. The Minister in Nicaragua (Hanna) to the Secretary of State.
- 30 August 1932. Vol. V. The Acting Secretary of State to the Minister in Nicaragua (Hanna).
- 20 October 1932. Vol. V. The Jefe Director of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua (Matthews) to the Nicaraguan Conservative Candidate for the Vice Presidency (Chamorro).
- 3 November 1932. Vol. V. The American Minister (Hanna) to the Nicaraguan Conservative Candidate for the Vice Presidency (Chamorro).
- 4 November 1932. Vol. V. Hanna to the Secretary of State.
- 5 November 1932. Vol. V. The American Minister (Hanna) to the Nicaraguan Liberal Candidate for the Presidency (Sacasa).
- 7 November 1932. Vol. V. The Minister in Nicaragua (Hanna) to the Secretary of State.
- 16 November 1932. Vol. V. The Jefe Director of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua (Matthews) to the American Chargé (Beaulac).
- 28 December 1932. Vol. V. The Secretary of State to the Minister in Nicaragua (Hanna).

28 December 1933. Vol. V. The Acting Secretary of State to the Minister in Nicaragua (Lane).

Miscellaneous Government Documents

“Interim Report of the Speaker’s Task Force on El Salvador,” 1990. Available from http://www.cja.org/downloads/Jesuits_Interim_Report_on_Task_Force.pdf

Magoon, Charles E. 1907. *Republic of Cuba: Report of Provisional Administration, From October 13th 1906 to December 1st 1907*. Havana: La and Bouza, Printers and Stationers.

Philippine Commission. 1900. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*. Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office.

“Tipitapa Agreement.” 1927. The Personal Representative of the President of the United States in Nicaragua (Stimson) to General Moncada. http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/sandino/tipitapa.htm#N_1 accessed February 26, 2012

U.S. War Department. Bureau of Insular Affairs. 1903. *Fourth Annual Report of the Philippine Commission*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. War Department. 1904. *Annual Reports of the War Department*. Vol. III, Reports of Division and Department Commanders. Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. War Department. 1904b. *Five Years of the War Department Following the War with Spain, 1899-1903, As Shown in the Annual Reports of the Secretary of War*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office.

NGO Documents

Human Rights Watch. 2001. *The ‘Sixth Division’: Military-paramilitary Ties and U.S. Policy in Colombia*. <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/colombia/>

Amnesty International. 2002. “Unmatched Power, Unmet Principles: The Human Rights Dimensions of U.S. Training of Foreign Military and Police Forces.” <http://www.amnestyusa.org/pdfs/msp.pdf>

“The Top 10 List.” 2009. Unpublished WHINSEC document on legislative strategy.

Interviews

Interview 1. Eric LeCompte, WHINSEC staff member, 11/19/2009, Columbus, Georgia.

Interview 2. WHINSEC staff member (anonymity requested). 11/20/2009, Columbus, Georgia.

Interview 3. Lisa Sullivan, WHINSEC staff member, 11/20/2009, Columbus, Georgia.

Secondary Sources

Abrahamson, James L. 1981. *American Army for a New Century: The Making of Great Military Power*. New York: The Free Press

Adams, Julia. 1996. "Principals and Agents, Colonialists and Company Men: The Decay of Colonial Control in the Dutch East Indies." *American Sociological Review* 61 (1): 12-28.

Adler, Emanuel. 1997. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 3: 319-363.

Alker, Howard R. 1996. *Rediscoveries and Reformulations: Humanistic Methodologies for International Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alker, Hayward R. 1985. "From Quantity to Quality: A New Research Program on Resolving Sequential Prisoner's Dilemmas." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, August.

Aranson, Cynthia J. 1989. *Crossroads: Congress, The Reagan Administration, and Central America*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Aron, Ravi and Jitendra V. Singh. 2005. "Getting Offshoring Right," *Harvard Business Review* December: 135-143.

Atkinson, Carol. 2006. "Constructivist Implications of Material Power: Military Engagement and the Socialization of States, 1972-2000." *International Studies Quarterly* 50: 509-537.

Avant, Deborah. 2004. *The Market of Force: The Consequences of Privatizing Security*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barkan, Elazar. 1992. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States Between the World Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barkawi, Tarak. 2006. *Globalization and War*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 1999. "The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization." *European Journal of International Relations* 5(4): 403-434.

Barkin, J. Samuel. 2010. *Realist Constructivism: Rethinking International Relations Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Barnett, Michael and Raymond Duvall. 2005. "Power in International Politics." *International Organization* 59: 39-75.
- Blakely, Ruth. 2006. "Still Training to Torture? US Training of Military Forces from Latin America." *Third World Quarterly* 27 (8): 1439-1461.
- Blount, James. 1913. *The American Occupation of the Philippines: 1898-1912*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, The Knickerbocker Press.
- Bruneau, Thomas C. et al. 2008. "Impact of International Military Education (IMET) on Graduate Education." Center for Civil-Military Relations, Naval Post-Graduate School.
- Burgerman, Susan. 2004. "First Do No Harm: U.S. Foreign Policy and Respect for Human Rights in El Salvador and Guatemala, 1980-96." In Liang-Fenton, Debra, ed. *Implementing U.S. Human Rights Policy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute for Peace Press.
- Buss, Andreas. 1999. "The Concept of Adequate Causation and Max Weber's Comparative Sociology in Religion." *British Journal of Sociology* 50(2): 317-329.
- Byman, Daniel and Sarah E. Kreps. 2010. Agents of Destruction? Applying Principal-Agent Analysis to State-Sponsored Terrorism. *International Studies Perspectives* 11: 1-18.
- Calder, Bruce J. 2006. *The Impact of Intervention: The Dominican Republic during the U.S. Occupation of 1916-1924*. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers.
- Campbell, David. 1998. *Writing Security: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Carpenter, Charli, Hrvoje Cvijanovic and Wesley Mason. 2011. "Security or Human Security? Civil-Military Relations in Battlestar Galactica." Unpublished manuscript.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. 1997. "International Norms and Domestic Politics: Bridging the Rationalist-Divide." *European Journal of International Relations* 3: 473-495.
- Chua, Amy. 2007. *Day of Empire: How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance—And Why they Fall*. New York: Random House.
- Clarke, Kevin A. and David M. Primo. 2012. *A Model Discipline: Political Science and the Logic of Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cline, Lawrence E. 2006. "The US Advisory Effort in El Salvador," in Gott, Kendall D., ed. *Security Assistance: U.S. and International Historical Perspectives*. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press.
- Cope, John A. 1995. "International Military Education and Training: An Assessment." McNair

Paper 44. Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, Washington DC.

- Danner, Mark. 1993. *The Massacre at El Mozote*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Davidson, Donald. 1963. "Actions, Reasons, and Causes." *The Journal of Philosophy* 60(23): 685-700.
- Dees, J. Gregory. 1992. "Principals, Agents, and Ethics," in *Ethics and Agency Theory: An Introduction*, eds. Norman E. Bowie and R. Edward Freeman, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DeGeorge, Richard T. 1992. "Agency Theory and the Ethics of Agency," in *Ethics and Agency Theory: An Introduction*, eds. Norman E. Bowie and R. Edward Freeman, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982. "Difference." In *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Doty, Roxanne. 1996. *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Paul Rabinow. 1982. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dunn, Kevin C. 2008. "Historical Representations." In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide*, eds. Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash.
- Duska, Ronald F. 1992. "Why Be a Loyal Agent? A Systemic Ethical Analysis," in *Ethics and Agency Theory: An Introduction*, eds. Norman E. Bowie and R. Edward Freeman, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellram, Lisa M., Wendy L. Tate, and Corey Billington. 2008. "Offshore Outsourcing of Professional Services: A Transaction Cost Economics Perspective," *Journal of Operations Management* 26: 148-163.
- Fearon, James and Alexander Wendt. 2002. "Rationalism vs. Constructivism: A Skeptical View," in Walter Carlsnaes, Thoms Risse, and Beth Simmons, eds. *The Handbook of International Relations*, London: Sage.
- Feaver, Peter D. 1996. The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control. *Armed Forces & Society* 23 (2): 149-178.
- Feaver, Peter D. 2003. *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Fierke, Karin M. and Knud Erik Jorgensen, eds. 2001. *Constructing International Relations: the Next Generation*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sherdian. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in Paul Rabinow, editor, *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2006. "Forward" in Samuel Huntington, *Political Order and Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Furedi, Frank. 1998. *The Silent War: Imperialism and the Changing Perception of Race*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Gareau, Frederick H. 2004. *States Terrorism and the United States: From Counterinsurgency to the War on Terrorism*. Atlanta: Clarity Press.
- Gates, John M. 1980. "The Alleged Isolation of U.S. Army Officers in the Late-19th Century." *Parameters: Journal of the U. S. Army War College* 10: 32-45.
- Gibbons, Michael T. 1987. *Interpreting Politics*. New York: New York University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1987. "Social Theory and Modern Sociology." Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gill, Lesley. 2004. *The School of the Americas: Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Gilman, Nils. 2003. *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Glassman, Jim. 1999. "State Power Beyond the 'Territorial Trap': The Internationalization of the State." *Political Geography* 18: 669-696.
- Glatthaar, Joseph T. 1990. *Forged In Battle: The Civil War Alliance of Black Soldiers and White Officers*. New York: Free Press.
- Gobat, Michel. 2005. *Confronting the American Dream: Nicaragua Under U.S. Imperial Rule*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Goldwert, Marvin. 1962. *The Constabulary in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua: Progeny and Legacy of United States Intervention*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Grimmett, Richard F. and Mark P. Sullivan. 2001. "U.S. Army School of the Americas:

- Background and Congressional Concerns.” Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress.
- Guttmann, Allen. 1965. “Political Ideals and the Military Ethic.” *American Scholar* 34: 221-237.
- Haugaard, Lisa. 1997. “Declassified Army and CIA Manuals Used in Latin America: An Analysis of Their Content.” *Latin America Working Group*. Available at www.lawg.org.
- Hawkins, Darren G., David A. Lake, Daniel L. Nielson, and Michael J. Tierney. 2006. “Delegation Under Anarchy: States, International Organizations, and Principal-Agent Theory.” In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, edited by Darren Hawkins, David Lake, Daniel Nielson, and Michael J. Tierney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, Darren G., David A. Lake, Daniel L. Nielson, and Michael J. Tierney. 2006. “Delegation Under Anarchy: States, International Organizations, and Principal-Agent Theory.” In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, edited by Darren Hawkins, David Lake, Daniel Nielson, and Michael J. Tierney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodge, James. 2004. *Disturbing the Peace: The Story of Father Roy Bourgeois and the Movement to Close the School of the Americas*. New York: Orbis Books.
- Hopf, Ted. 2010. “The Logic of Habit in International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 16(4); 539-561.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1957 *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Hurley, Vic. 1938. *Jungle Patrol: The Story of the Philippine Constabulary*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc.
- Inayatullah, Naeem and David L. Blaney. 2004. *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*. New York: Routledge.
- Israel, Jerry. 1972. “A Diplomatic Machine: Scientific Management in the Department of State, 1906-1924. In Jerry Israel, ed., *Building the Organizational Society: Essays on Associational Activities in Modern America*. New York: The Free Press.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2006. *Civilizing The Enemy: Germany Reconstruction and the Invention of the West*. Ann Arbor: University Of Michigan Press.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2008. “Foregrounding Ontology: Dualism, Monism, and IR Theory.” *Review of International Studies* 34: 129-53.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2011. *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy*

- of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, Robert. 1990. *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. 2000. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1960. *The Professional Soldier*. New York: The Free Press.
- Jensen, Michael C. and William H. Meckling. 1976. "Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure." *Journal of Financial Economics* 3 (4): 305-360.
- Kalberg, Stephen. 2002. "Introduction." In Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Kaplan, Robert D. 2005. *Imperial Grunts: On The Ground with the American Military, from Mongolia to the Philippines to Iraq and Beyond*. New York: Random House.
- Kasprzak, Emma. 2012. "Afghanistan Conflict: Rise of 'Green on Blue' Deaths." *BBC News*, May 17.
- King, Gary, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Klotz, Audie. 1995. *Norms in International Relations: The Struggle Against Apartheid*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Klotz, Audie and Cecilia Lynch. 2007. *Strategies for Research in constructivist International Relations*. New York: M.E. Sharp.
- Koford, Kenneth and Mark Penno. 1992. "Accounting, Principal-Agent Theory, and Self-Interested Behavior," in *Ethics and Agency Theory: An Introduction*, eds. Norman E. Bowie and R. Edward Freeman, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krebs, Ronald R. 2005. "One Nation Under Arms? Military Participation and the Politics of Identity." *Security Studies* 14 (3): 529-564.
- Krebs, Ronald R. and Jennifer K. Lobasz. 2007. "Fixing the Meaning of 9/11: Hegemony, Coercion, and the Road to War in Iraq." *Security Studies* 16 (3): 409-451.
- Kubalkova, Vendulka, Nicholas Onuf, Paul Kowert, eds. 1998. *International Relations in a Constructed World*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Kulikowski, Michael. 2007. *Rome's Gothic Wars: From the Third Century to Alaric*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Kuzmarov, Jeremy. 2009. "Modernizing Repression: Police Training, Political Violence, and Nation-Building in the 'American Century.'" *Diplomatic History* 33(2): 191-221.
- Lane, Jack. 1973. "The Military Profession's Search for Identity." *Marine Corps Gazette* 57: 6 (1-9 [digital version through ProQuest]).
- Latham, Michael E. 2011. *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Laurienti, Jerry M. 2007. *The U.S. Military and Human Rights Promotion: Lessons from Latin America*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Security International.
- Liang-Fenton, Debra. 2004. "Conclusion: What Works?" in Liang-Fenton, Debra, ed. *Implementing U.S. Human Rights Policy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute for Peace Press.
- Lieuwen, Edwin 1961. *Arms and Politics in Latin America*. New York: Frederick A Praeger.
- Linn, Brian McAllister. 1989. *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Machoian, Ronald G. 2006. *William Harding Carver and the American Army: A Soldier's Story*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Marcella, Gabriel. 1986. "Security, Democracy, and Development: The United States and Latin American in the Next Decade," *Air University Review* July-August: 2-14.
- McClintock, Michael. 1985. "US Military Assistance to El Salvador: From Indirect to Direct Intervention." *Race & Class* 26 (3): 63-82.
- McCoy Katherine E. 2005. "Trained to Torture? The Human Rights Effects of Military Training at the School of the Americas," *Latin American Perspectives* 32: 47-64.
- McCoy, Katherine E. 2010. "Beyond Civil-Military Relations: Reflections on Civilian Control of a Private, Multinational Workforce." *Armed Forces & Society* 36: 671-694.
- Meixsel, Richard. 2002. "The Philippine Scout Mutiny of 1924." *South East Asia Research* 10 (3): 333-359.
- Miller, Gary J. 1992. "Ethics and the New Game Theory," in *Ethics and Agency Theory: An Introduction*, eds. Norman E. Bowie and R. Edward Freeman, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, Gary J. 2005. The Political Evolution of Principal-Agent Models. *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 203-25.

- Millet, Allan R. 1972. "The Rise and Fall of the Cuban Rural Guard, 1898-1912." *The Americas* 29 (2): 191-213.
- Millet, Allan R. 1989. "Professional Military Education and Marine Officers." *Marine Corps Gazette* 73 (11): 46-56.
- Millet, Richard L. 1977. *Guardians of the Dynasty: A History of the U.S. Created Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua and the Somoza Family*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Millet, Richard L. 2004. The Limits of Influence: Training the Guardias in Latin America. In *Turning Victory Into Success: Military Operations After the Campaign*, ed. Brian M De Toy. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press.
- Millet, Richard L. 2010. *Searching for Stability: The U.S. Development of Constabulary Forces in Latin America and the Philippines*, Occasional Paper 30. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press.
- Mitnick, Barry M. 1992. "The Theory of Agency and Organizational Analysis," in *Ethics and Agency Theory: An Introduction*, eds. Norman E. Bowie and R. Edward Freeman, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mulrine, Anna. 2011. "US military assistance for foreign forces: a wise investment?; The US military dispenses billions of dollars to foreign forces each year. Pentagon says the investment boosts diplomatic leverage, citing the Egypt crisis. Critics say it does little to advance US goals." *The Christian Science Monitor*, March 1.
- Nalty, Bernard C. 1968. *The United States Marines in Nicaragua*. Washington, D.C.: Historical Branch, G-3 Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.
- Nelson-Pallmeyer, J and Roy Bourgeois. 1997. *School of Assassins: Guns, Greed and Globalization*. New York: Orbis Books.
- Nenninger, Timothy K. 1978. *The Leavenworth Schools and the Old Army: Education, Professionalism, and the Officers Corps of the United States Army*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Neumann, Iver B. 2008. "Discourse Analysis." In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide*, eds. Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Nye, Joseph P. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- O'Hagan, Jacinta. 2004. "'The Power and the Passion': Civilizational Identity and Alterity in

- the Wake of September 11.” In *Identity and Global Politics: Empirical and Theoretical Elaborations*, eds. Patricia M. Goff and Kevin C. Dunn, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Onuf, Nicholas and Frank F. Klink. 1989. “Anarchy, Authority, Rule.” *International Studies Quarterly* 33(2): 149-173.
- Onuf, Nicholas. 1998. “Constructivism: A User’s Manual.” In *International Relations in a Constructed World*, eds. Vendulka Kubalkova, Nicholas Onuf, and Paul Kowert. 58-78. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Perez, Louis A. 1972. “Supervision of a Protectorate: The United States and the Cuban Army, 1898-1908.” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 52 (2): 250-271.
- Perez, Louis A. 1976. *Army Politics in Cuba, 1898-1958*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Perez, Louis A. 1982. “Intervention, Hegemony, and Dependency: The United States in the Circum-Caribbean, 1898-1980.” *The Pacific Historical Review*. 51 (2): 165-194.
- Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay* (Third edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- Petersen, Trond. 1993. “Recent Developments in: The Economics of Organization: The Principal-Agent Relationship.” *Acta Sociologica* 36 (3): 277-293.
- Price, Richard and Christian Reus-Smit. 1998. “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism.” *European Journal of International Relations* 4 (3): 259-294.
- Quinlivan, James T. 1999. “Coup-Proofing: Its Practice and Consequences in the Middle East.” *International Security* 24 (2): 131-165.
- Rabe, Stephen G. 1988. *Eisenhower and Latin America: The Foreign Policy of Anticommunism*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Rabe, Stephen G. 1999. *The Most Dangerous Area in the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina.
- Renda, Mary A. 2001. *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation and the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915-1940*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Reveron, Derek S. 2010. *Exporting Security*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 1996. *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention, and Hegemony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rosenberg, Matthew. 2012. "Afghanistan's Soldiers Step Up Killings of Allied Forces." *The New York Times*, January 20.
- Ruby, Tomislav Z. and Douglas Gibling. 2010. "US Professional Military Education and Democratization Abroad." *European Journal of International Relations* 20 (10): 1-26.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Salehyan, Idean. 2010. "The Delegation of War to Rebel Organizations." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 54: 493-515.
- Shafter, M. Michael. 1988. *Deadly Paradigms: The Failure of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schmidt, Hans. 1987. *Maverick Marine: General Smedley D. Butler and the Contradictions of American Military History*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Schmidt, Hans. 1995. *The United States Occupation of Haiti: 1915-1934*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Schneider, Dieter. 1987. "Agency Costs and Transaction Costs: Flops in the Principal-Agent-Theory of Financial Markets," in *Agency Theory, Information, and Incentives*, eds. G. Bamberg and K. Spremann. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sereseres, Caesar D. 1979. "U.S. Military Aid, Authoritarian Rule and Military Politics in Central America." *Armed Forces & Society* 5: 329-333.
- Shapiro, Susan P. 2005. "Agency Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 263-84.
- Shifter, Michael and Jennifer Stillerman. 2004. "U.S. Human Rights Policy Toward Colombia" in Liang-Fenton, Debra, ed. *Implementing U.S. Human Rights Policy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute for Peace Press.
- Shimmelfennig, Frank. 2001. "The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union." *International Organization* 55: 1, pp. 47-80.
- Shulimson, Jack. 1996. "Military Professionalism: The Case of the U.S. Marine Officer Corps, 1880-1898." *The Journal of Military History* 60 (2): 231-242.
- Sikkink, Kathryn. 2004. *Mixed Signals: U.S. Human Rights Policy and Latin America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Singer, P.W. 2003. *Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sowers, Thomas. 2005. Beyond the Soldier and the State: Contemporary Operations and Variance in Principal-Agent Relationships. *Armed Forces & Society* 31: 385-409.
- Spremann, Klaus. 1987. "Agent and Principal," in *Agency Theory, Information, and Incentives*, eds. G. Bamberg and K. Spremann. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Tilly, Charles. 2006. "History of and in Sociology." Introduction to the Didactic Seminar on Methodologies of the History of Sociology, American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, August 12.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. 1984. *The Conquest of America*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Twichell, Heath Jr. 1974. *Allen: The Biography of an Army Officer 1859-1930*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Vasquez, John A. 1997. "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition." *The American Political Science Review* 91 (4): 899-912.
- Vestring, Till. 2005. "Hedge Your Offshoring Bets," *MIT Sloan Management Review* 46(3): 27-29.
- Walt, Stephen. 1987. *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1997. "Evaluating Theories." *The American Political Science Review* 91 (4): 913-917.
- Weber, Max. 2002. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Weldes, Jutta. 1999. *Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wendt, Alexander and Daniel Friedheim. 1995. "Hierarchy Under Anarchy: Information Empire and the East German State." *International Organization* 49(4): 689-721.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wendt, Alexander. 2000. "On the Via Media: A Response to the Critics." *Review of International Studies* 26: 165-180.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2009. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

- Williamson, John, ed. 1983. *IMF Conditionality*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2003. *Empire of Capital*. London: Verso.
- Wright, Peter, Ananda Mukherji, and Mark J. Kroll. 2001. A Reexamination of Agency Theory Assumptions: Extensions and Extrapolations. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 30: 413-429.
- Wright, Peter, Ananda Mukherji, and Mark J. Kroll. 2001. A Reexamination of Agency Theory Assumptions: Extensions and Extrapolations. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 30: 413-429.
- Yee, Albert S. 1996. "The Causal Effects of Ideas on Policies." *International Organization* 50 (1): 69-108.
- Zehfuss, Maja. 2002. *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eric R. Rittinger

Political Science Department, Maxwell School of Citizenship & Public Affairs
 Syracuse University, 100 Eggers Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244
 Cell: 315.576.1376 Email: errittin@maxwell.syr.edu
<https://sites.google.com/site/ericrittinger>

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Political Science, expected December 2012, Syracuse University

Specializations in international relations (security, foreign policy, IR theory); comparative politics (civil-military relations, Latin American politics); and qualitative methodology

Dissertation (defended: September 14, 2012)

The Risks of Outsourcing Security: Foreign Security Forces in United States National Security Policy

Committee: Audie Klotz (chair), Brian Taylor, Matthew Cleary, Mark Rupert, and Patrick T. Jackson (American University)

Now as much as ever, the United States wants foreign security forces to promote *its* national security policy. How does the U.S. ensure that they do so? By applying principal-agent theory to diplomatic history, I find that the U.S. has sought compliance from its military proxies in radically different ways, depending on the particular identities attributed to those proxies. This finding advances principal-agent theory by linking the principal's perception of its agent to its preferred means of tightening agency slack.

M.A., Political Science, May 2008, Syracuse University

B.A., International Studies, December 2004, American University

Minor: Spanish Language

University Honors in International Studies, summa cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa

RESEARCH GRANTS & FELLOWSHIPS

Dissertation Completion Fellowship, Syracuse University Political Science Department, Fall 2011-Spring 2012

Goekjian Research Grant, awarded by the Moynihan Institute for Global Affairs of the Maxwell School for archival research related to dissertation, Summer 2010

Roscoe-Martin Research Grant, awarded by the Maxwell School for archival research related to dissertation, Spring 2010

Departmental Travel Grant, awarded by the Syracuse University Political Science Department for field research, July 2008 and November 2009

Maxwell Dean's Summer Assistantship, awarded by the Maxwell School for research collaboration with faculty member, Summer 2008

Summer Fellowship, awarded by the Maxwell School Dean's office for summer research support, Summers 2008 and 2009

University Graduate Fellowship, Syracuse University Graduate School, 2006-2010

PAPERS UNDER REVIEW

"Confronting Coup Risk in the Latin American Left" with Matt Cleary (R&R, *Studies in Comparative International Development*)

WORKING PAPERS

"Professionalism, Partisanship, and Agency: U.S. Foreign Security Force Development in the Caribbean Basin, 1899-1933," manuscript under preparation

"Putting the Moral in 'Moral Hazard': Agency, Human Rights, and United States Foreign Security Force Development," manuscript under preparation

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Instructor, Political Science Department, Syracuse University

- *International Security* (Summer 2011), seminar-style course
- *International Relations* (Summer 2010), introductory course

Discussion-Section Leader, Political Science Department, Syracuse University

- *International Relations* (Fall 2007, Fall 2008)

Teaching Assistant, Political Science Department, Syracuse University

- *Latin American Politics* (Spring 2009; Fall 2012)
- *Inter-American Relations* (Spring 2008)

Teaching Associate, Political Science Department, Syracuse University (2008-09)

- Earned position by demonstrating excellent performance as a Teaching Assistant
- Organized seminars on pedagogy and professional development

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Political Science Department Research Assistantship (Fall 2012)

- Assisting Matthew Cleary with an NSF grant to generate a database and a field experiment related to ethnic politics in Mexico

Political Science Department Research Assistantship (2010-2011)

- Collaborated with Matthew Cleary on a project related to leftist presidents in Latin America

Summer Project Assistantship Program, Syracuse University (Summer 2008)

ADDITIONAL METHODS TRAINING

2009 Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research, sponsored by the Consortium for Qualitative Research Methods, Syracuse University

- Advanced training in historiography and archival research, within-case and comparative case studies, concept-building, process-tracing, and discourse analysis

INVITED TALKS

“Sovereignty for Puerto Rico? A Discussion with Ángel Collado Schwarz,” panelist, Syracuse University, April 9, 2012

“Archival Research and Historiography,” guest presentation for graduate seminar on qualitative methodology, Syracuse University, October 17, 2011

CONFERENCE PAPERS

“Risking Human Rights: United States Foreign Security Assistance and the Threat of Human Rights Abuse,” paper to be presented at the APSA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, September 2012

“Alterity and Agency: Finding the Discursive Basis of the Principal-Agent Problem in the Development of Foreign Security Forces,” paper presented at ISA-NE, Providence, Rhode Island, November 2011 and to be presented at the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, Kingston, Canada, November 2012

“‘He Ain’t No Brother of Mine’: United States Resistance and Responses to Foreign Security Force Development in the Philippines, Dominican Republic, and Haiti: 1899-1934,” paper presented at the ISA Annual Convention, Montreal, Canada, March 2011

CONFERENCE TRAVEL GRANTS

Departmental Travel Grant, awarded by the Syracuse University Political Science Department, APSA Annual Meeting, Summer 2012

APSA Travel Grant, Summer 2012

ISA-Northeast Travel Grant, Fall 2011

PAPER PRESENTATIONS AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

"Developing Foreign Security Forces (FSF) in the 'Developing World': United States Considerations of the Cold War FSF Problem," paper presented at the Political Science Research Workshop, November 12, 2010

"From 'Dubious Experiment' to 'Force Multiplier': The Evolution of US Foreign Military Training," paper presented at the Political Science Research Workshop, October 9, 2009

"Imperialism In the Disservice of Empire: The Evolution of U.S. Foreign Military Training," paper presented at the Political Science Research Workshop, November 21, 2008

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Global Politics Seminar (workshop for presenting works in progress), Political Science Department, Syracuse University, November 5, 2010

- Discussant for paper presented by Peter Katzenstein, "Risk and Uncertainty in Hard Times"

Identity in International Relations Reading Group, coordinated by Audie Klotz, Political Science Department, Syracuse University, 2007-2010

- Workshop related to constructivist theory and methodology

SYRACUSE UNIVESRSITY SERVICE

President, Political Science Graduate Student Association, 2010-2011

Search committee for new faculty, Political Science Department, Fall 2007

Graduate student mentor for one Ph.D. student and one M.A. student, Political Science Department, 2011-2012

RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE

International Trade Research Assistant, Georgetown Economic Services, a subsidiary of the law firm Kelley Drye & Warren (2005-2006)

Research Intern, Arms Division, Human Rights Watch (2005)

