INTRODUCTION

“together we can prevail, and must prevail”

(Prime Minister of Jamaica, the Honourable Bruce Golding)

On July 4, 2009, the region celebrated thirty-six years as a formal Caribbean Community (CARICOM). The analyses contained in this publication in the “The Integrationist Series” all tend to suggest that CARICOM now, more than ever, needs to transform its experiences over these years into a more structured foundation for maximising the multiplier effects of collective representation, and for leveraging CARICOM’s diplomatic efforts and resources in a more coordinated and integrated manner. This imperative is necessitated by the rapidly changing international environment which has far too often impacted negatively on small developing countries, leaving them increasingly vulnerable and marginalised.

In their relationships with developed countries, the latter is shifting emphasis from commitments to fostering programmes for economic and social development; greater concern is now being placed on security in all its dimensions including drug trafficking, deportations and money laundering. Additionally, there appears to be less disquiet at the political level for ending preferences and subsidies, following the signing of the ACP-EU Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) as countries become compliant with the World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules. New trade agreements seem to emphasise market-based solutions, without much concern for ending poverty in small developing countries, with the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) being lofty expectations that are, unfortunately, beyond the reach of many developing countries, including some in CARICOM, where progress with the MDGs has been uneven. In this regard, Ambassador Edwin Laurent finds that even though the performance in attaining these goals is commendable given the circumstances, he asserts that this should not be a basis for complacency, adding that there is room for improvement. He notes, however, that since foreign aid budgets have been cut, it is likely that funding for the MDGs will have to be sourced from domestic economic growth and particularly, from expanded production and exports.
When all these issues are conflated, it is clear that a new approach to managing CARICOM diplomatic efforts must be considered. The old ways of setting policy and managing CARICOM’s Diplomacy are obsolete. The benefits from past diplomatic initiatives at the bilateral level may no longer outweigh the benefits to be obtained from collective and synchronised action at the regional, hemispheric and global levels. Furthermore, speaking with one voice and voting collectively on issues that matter to the survival of small vulnerable economies, is critical for CARICOM success in navigating this very fluid global environment. A cohesive CARICOM Foreign Policy should promote the collective interests of CARICOM in the area of economic prosperity and advancement. It should support political, cultural, religious and social freedoms; it should emphasise peaceful cooperation, regional security and environmental sustainability; it should accentuate the value of human rights, equity, fairness and good governance; and it should seek to integrate the Diaspora into its programming framework so as to bolster its leverage with third States.

No less important should be the notion that CARICOM Foreign Policy coordination can provide the platform for optimising the gains from diplomatic efforts, especially when the constraints of size and influence matter in the international arena.

This publication addresses these and other related issues aimed at finding a new dispensation that are central to shaping CARICOM progress in the 21st century. In particular, the critical questions CARICOM policy makers should answer are: What should be the nature, focus and institutional arrangements for a successful CARICOM Foreign Policy in a globalised world? What sort of collective governance structures and communication mechanism should be in place in order to inform our collective diplomacy and representation, while maximising the use of our valuable resources in the CARICOM Diaspora? Above all, how do we distribute the benefits of an integrated CARICOM in a tangible, accessible and equitable manner to CARICOM citizenry? Finding answers to these questions, among others, must be central to informing the new CARICOM Diplomatic focus.

In this regard, the paper by Professor Benn is instructive. He argues that CARICOM Foreign Policy was structured on a framework that applies the theory of concentricity in which the imperatives for community action are determined within a series of concentric relations, radiating from the CARICOM Core and expanding to the wider Caribbean, Latin America, the hemispheric system, and the global South. He also advances the promotion of ‘growth triangles’ as adopted by Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore and asserts that a similar arrangement can be the foundation for the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME). In
this context, he outlines a number of specific measures designed to enable the Community to optimise its development possibilities and also to ensure its more effective participation in the international system.

Buttressing this framework is a governance mechanism that seeks to enhance the decision-making process within which collective action can be institutionalised. The papers by Ambassador Gomes and Professor Hunte address this issue. Ambassador Gomes notes that CARICOM is seen as a dubious mixture of elegant declarations, nebulous benefits, limited practical gains and mechanisms that are, unfortunately, accompanied by a paralysis of policy-implementation. He asserts that to re-energise CARICOM, there is the need to embrace a political vision that includes supranational institutions and the need to implement institutional transformations that could enhance the operation and effectiveness of the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) and the CSME.

Professor Hunte, in turn, argues that perhaps the pull-factors of sovereignty may have forestalled deeper collective CARICOM Agreements restricting Heads of Governments and Legislative Bodies from moving too far ahead of their constituents and beyond their political mandate. He also claims that there is a trade-off between sovereignty and unanimity and that much can be learned from the OECS model, contending that it has begun to build supranational institutions that leverage resources, provide executive authority and shared responsibility, while working in a transparent and accountable manner. Consequently, reducing the pull of sovereignty will enhance unanimity that is vital for CARICOM transformation. Such a transformation will facilitate the delivery of more public goods and services to CARICOM citizens; it will encourage intra-CARICOM investments; and it will support a mechanism for combining diplomatic services in third states. Above all, by including the Diaspora and civil society in diplomatic efforts formulated under supranational institutions, this approach will strengthen coverage in developed countries, deepening outreach, creating new alliances, eschewing unnecessary replication and improving intergovernmental coordination. Small CARICOM states have no alternative but to embrace supranational institutions at a time when the global environment responds more favourably to multilateral rather than unilateral action.

To understand more succinctly the global environment and its impact on CARICOM, papers by Professor Sir Kenneth Hall, Sir Courtney Blackman, and Drs Davies, Meighoo, Herisse and Insanally present perspectives that corroborate the need for collective action. Professor Sir Kenneth notes that the “... most significant impact of globalisation on Caribbean development is the destruction of the consensus that has guided policymaking since the end of the Second World War and particularly during the 1960s. Small Caribbean States have sought
to respond creatively to the challenges facing them by embracing a strategy of regional integration (OECS), while at the same time pursuing a pattern of concentric diplomacy aimed at expanding their trade and economic links with other countries . . . .”

Reflecting on the complexity of the world economy, both Sir Courtney Blackman and Dr Omar Davies examine the indicators that have caused the global financial crisis and address the implications for the Caribbean. In the case of Sir Courtney, he identifies the factors leading up to the current “melt-down” in the United States financial system and posits that the crisis is the result of the failure of the neoliberalism and the shareholder maximisation paradigms. As a way out of this difficult environment, he recommends, “Caribbean scholars should move with dispatch to develop a paradigm that meets the needs of regional decision-makers . . . and identifies some critical areas where considerable economic gains might be made . . .” Dr Davies provides an analysis of the global financial crisis in the context of several institutional failures, including laxity in regulation, collusion, mismanagement of credit and credit rating agencies, and identifies failures by fiscal and monetary policymakers. He further contends that completely free market forces, without government oversight and regulation in some markets, goes to the heart of the financial crisis and is highly critical of the Multilateral Financial Institutions which adopt different standards for developed countries as compared with developing counties. For example, providing financing to bankrupt financial institutions in developed countries while recommending the closure of similar financial institution in developing countries, is one observation made by the author, where it would appear that ‘too big to fail’ is perhaps a preserve of only developed countries.

Dr Kirk Meighoo, like Sir Courtney, contends that a new paradigm is needed for CARICOM progress. He asserts that the current model is flawed, adding that “securing market access through preferential trade agreements and quotas, increased foreign investment in vertically integrated multinational industries, and development assistance through aid and soft loans for governments . . . perpetuate(s) underdevelopment and poverty in the Caribbean”. This has been the path chosen for the last thirty years and it has not fostered development, but has indirectly contributed to the high unemployment rate and the increasing migration rate of skilled labour in an ever-expanding Caribbean Diaspora. He advocates less government dominance and supports “an innovative-entrepreneurial onshore economy . . .”

One of the distinguishing features of the changing global environment, especially after the Cold War, is the increasing importance and relevance of India, China and Brazil. These countries account for a large share of the world population
and economic activity; and, collectively, have the potential for dominating world
affairs in a significant way in the not too distant future. Permanent seats for
India and Brazil on the Security Council at the United Nations are not beyond
their grasp; so too, are their expected elevated status in the corridors of power
in international financial institutions. Being holders of nuclear technology and
armaments (India and China) certainly enhances their claims on the world
stage. These factors alone suggest that CARICOM must have serious diplomatic
relations with these countries as they can empathise with the issues in developing
countries as they were and are still leading members in this group.

Furthermore, China has expanded its Caribbean outreach; and is a major
player in world trade, acquiring significant balance of payment surpluses with
the US and many CARICOM countries. India, in contrast, has a similar colonial
past to the English-Speaking Caribbean; it has a significant pool of skilled
workers that is engaged in producing technology and information products and
services; and it has been a source of training and skills development for some
CARICOM countries. Brazil launched a successful energy programme that
makes use of sugarcane in the production of ethanol and is a leading player in
world markets for this commodity, but only a few CARICOM countries have
benefitted from this new technology. Papers by Tingle-Smith, Hall, Benn and
Rigobert provide useful information on the partnerships India, China and Brazil
share with CARICOM, while Erikson and Wander describe some of the political
dimensions on issues related to the One-China Policy, linking it to the nexus
between China and Taiwan and some Caribbean countries. They also allude to
the likely concerns the US may have with China in the Western Hemisphere.
Additionally, Tingle-Smith examines CARICOM-Brazil relations and describes
potential opportunities for trade. Given these favourable circumstances, it may
be argued that the friendship CARICOM has with these countries augurs well
for the future, once sustained diplomatic efforts and resources are applied to the
tasks ahead of greater cooperation and coordination in the international arena.

CARICOM’s diplomatic relations in the Western Hemisphere during the
early 1970s were set against the backdrop of the Cold War, where the United
States considered the region a part of its sphere of influence; and anything that
was perceived to be antithetical to American interest drew swift reaction from
Washington. For example, the central point of the Cold War in the Western
Hemisphere centred on Cuba; and establishing diplomatic relations with Cuba
was seen as an affront to the interest of the United States. Professor Vaughn A.
Lewis captures in his paper some of the early actions by Jamaica, Trinidad and
Tobago, Guyana and Barbados who established diplomatic relations with Cuba,
contrary to United States’ wishes. He also describes the political environment at
that time, incorporating the events of Chile, among other countries, and presents a partial narrative explaining how political and economic events have changed since then. Dr Cotman presents an equally important piece on the recent diplomatic relationships since 2002 between Cuba and five CARICOM countries, namely, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Grenada and Barbados. He examines the convergence of foreign policy agendas in these countries with that of Cuba; he describes the South-South cooperation in human development; and discusses how certain factors propel or retard bilateral relations.

On the subject of South-South cooperation and trade, Professor Girvan provides a detailed description of the Bolivarian Alternative (ALBA) and the PetroCaribe programme initiated and funded by Venezuela for countries in the Western Hemisphere. Specifically, the Bolivarian Alternative and PetroCaribe are unique programmes in which Venezuela is cast as a donor country and all other participants are seen as recipients of aid flows that in many ways are different from the standard programmes negotiated between developed and developing countries or even with multilateral agencies. Professor Girvan further describes the conditions under which countries would be eligible for membership and be able to access the subsidised Oil Programmes. He also identifies potential areas of concern and conflict for CARICOM countries, given the Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas and the outstanding territorial issue between Venezuela and Guyana.

Rashleigh Jackson, a former Foreign Minister of Guyana, provides a discussion on effective foreign policy coordination that has been used collectively by Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago, Guyana, Grenada, and Barbados on several issues that affected Cuba, Guyana and Belize at the Organisation of American States and the Inter-American Development Bank. He refers to the path-breaking work CARICOM undertook in finding a mechanism to advance the common interest of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) group in their relations with Europe. He also takes into account several other contributions that CARICOM has made through effective Foreign Policy Coordination, achieving positive results that no single CARICOM country working independently could have achieved.

Even though CARICOM Heads of Government have signed the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA), several writers, including academics, have raised a number of concerns that signal their disagreement with the signed EPA. Many lament that the EPA is not a well-balanced agreement, as it does not foster development, but may even retard it. For example, Professor Brewster contends that the EPA does not adequately address investment, development finance, infrastructure, trade and technical barriers, among other issues. No less poignant is a paper on investment in the EPA by Gus Van Harten, who argues against
the foreign investment provisions, claiming that it could hinder development and regional integration and may even restrict the use of domestic instruments that policy makers can offer. Equally compelling is the paper by Professor Clive Thomas who presents a detailed analysis of the EPA. He not only generically identifies proponents and opponents by their positions, but he also focuses on the costs and benefits of the EPA. He analyses the institutional weaknesses in the design and architectural flaws leading up to the preparation and signing of the EPA; and bemoans the lack of learning from previous negotiations and agreements, as well as the poor communication with CARICOM citizens.

Noting that CARICOM external trade negotiations, be it the EPA or CARICOM-USA Trade, should rest on an approach that succinctly draws its focus from a CARICOM development agenda, Ambassador Collins argues that this was not the case for the EPA. He also expressed disappointment that the essential nexus between foreign policy and the community development process, though fully recognised by CARICOM Leaders, was lacking in recent trade negotiations. In view of this concern, and in order to address other global issues, he advances the idea that the Council for Foreign and Community Relations (COFCOR) should be restructured, building an effective programme aimed at deepening the CARICOM development process.

There are, of course, counter arguments that lead to the opposite view suggesting that the EPA was the best that could have been obtained in the current environment. Arguing this case in the publication is the former Prime Minister of Barbados, the Right Honourable Owen Arthur. He makes the point that: decisions had to be made in a changing environment that deemphasised preferences; embraced diversification away from mono crop cultivation; ended trade protectionism as part of the World Trade Organisation rules; and which saw a reduction in the commitment from our traditional support base, especially in Britain. In this regard, he states that in today’s world, the war on terrorism, a Europe of twenty-five, a new development focus on Africa, and the changing global economic balance of power consequent upon the end of the Cold War have marginalized the Caribbean in European circles. Britain’s perspectives have also changed. It has, Arthur notes, reordered its global political outlook and the priorities of its foreign policies in a manner that has diminished the significance of the ties of a shared history with the Caribbean. That the Caribbean is very much on the margins of thinking in Whitehall is borne out in the UK’s Foreign Policy Document of 2003 which placed emphasis on a number of cross-cutting global themes, and the strengthening of a number of key relationships. The Caribbean scarcely generated serious mention. He concludes that the specific point to be noted is that an Economic Partnership Agreement with Europe
has been negotiated in a climate within which Europe, in its dealings with the Caribbean, would rather focus on security issues, including the illicit drug trade, tax avoidance, migration and money laundering, rather than on development.

That an appropriate development framework is lacking, especially for small developing countries, is an issue that needs further study and this is certainly beyond the scope of this publication but pertinent, nevertheless, to finding solutions to the investment and development problems in CARICOM.

Meanwhile, Katharina Serrano in her paper proposes several suggestions that can address some of these problems, even as she acknowledges that the EPA has its limitations and recommends that ways must be found not to abandon the EPA, but to limit its negative impact on CARIFORUM countries. Among the suggestions is the need to harmonize the regional investment rules in order to make them coherent with international investment standards. She proposes the establishment of a Regional Standardization for Development Office and recommends the deployment of well-trained CARIFORUM negotiators who will build capacity for negotiating agreements that satisfy CARIFORUM development requirements, even as they study and monitor the standard-setting behaviour of International Organisations. The recently approved Office of Trade Negotiations can be tasked with this responsibility.

Building capacity is also tied to working cooperatively with countries that have similar experiences and expectations as well as employing protocols that allow positions to be heard and endorsed in international meetings that matter. CARICOM needs protocols and coalitions to advance its positions in trade negotiations in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and working with other small vulnerable economies (SVEs) is one approach that is explored by Andrea Ewart in this publication. She examines the evolution of a coalition of SVEs within the WTO and addresses how agenda setting is undertaken in the “Green Room” at the Ministerial Conferences. She posits that CARICOM and SVEs should focus their efforts only on those proposals that would be favourably considered by the WTO, as this would advance their collective interests.

In a similar approach, Emalene Marcus-Burnett examines the strategies employed by CARICOM countries in the Uruguay and Doha Rounds of Trade Negotiations and supports in many ways the strategies outlined by Andrea Ewart, especially with respect to CARICOM speaking with one voice and building coalitions. She notes, however, the level of CARICOM fragmentation and identifies the situation in Geneva, where there are four CARICOM countries (Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and Haiti) operating more or less independently of each other with separate representations. Present also in Geneva is the joint representation for six members of the OECS and a separate representation by
the Regional Negotiating Machinery (CRNM), with the possibility of one more representation by another CARICOM country under consideration. Given this kind of fragmentation, it is clear that if CARICOM had integrated national and regional trade programmes and strategies that could be defended by CARICOM negotiators, then there would be no need for so many separate missions. Instead, only one representation would suffice, releasing thereby scarce human and financial resources, while capturing important synergies and leveraging the diplomatic influence of a group of SVEs.

With the loss of EU preferences and subsidies, CARICOM-US Trade has become the single most important market for CARICOM Trade, accounting for a significant share of CARICOM exports and imports. Dr Petrick examines the trade agreements in which the emphasis has changed over the years from financial aid and government intervention to a new focus on free markets, with less trade barriers, and less subsidies and preferences in most cases. He discusses the importance of import duties as a source of government revenue for several CARICOM countries and recommends that CARICOM should plan for the time when preferences will end, adding that the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) is not sustainable and it may be plausible for CARICOM to seek a trade agreement similar to what obtains under NAFTA.

Land borders, the contents and boundaries of the sea and ocean, natural vegetation, including the flora and fauna, forest, minerals, fresh water and a pristine environment, together with air and sea transport infrastructure and airplane and boat services all contribute in no small way to the salubrious tapestry of CARICOM. A cursory examination of these resources will suggest that there is much to maintain and preserve in a sustainable way for future generations. For example, the CARICOM tourism industry can be severely damaged, if pollution degrades the quality of the sands and seas of the Caribbean. Likewise, over-fishing and above optimal harvesting can decimate a renewable resource, generating our own ‘Tragedy of the Commons’. The poor use of chemicals can contaminate fresh water sources, damaging the environment and endangering the life of many.

Obviously, managing such a vast collection of assets is not only complex and expensive for CARICOM States, but it requires collaborative efforts and diplomatic initiatives that involve both CARICOM and non-CARICOM countries. Above all, it requires a governance mechanism that is supported by international law and United Nations dispute settlement protocols. It also requires management and security systems that are both national and regional in scope, while fostering at the same time employment opportunities for sustainable
economic development as well as preserving the environment and reversing the negative effects of climate change.

In this publication, Mr Francois Jackman and Dr Barton Scotland tackle the issues related to the ocean and fisheries; Dr Ulric Trotz probes the questions related to climate change and the environment, while Hilton McDavid and Dr Jessica Byron address national and regional security. Specifically, Jackman posits that countries must work cooperatively in order to avoid marine degradation, as unilateral action in one’s environment is useless when contiguous borders are involved. He acknowledges, however, that CARICOM has concluded some important regional agreements in this area, but suggests that much more work must be done, especially at the technical and diplomatic levels, if sustainability and improved governance of these resources are to be achieved.

In keeping with Jackman’s contribution, Dr Barton Scotland’s paper contains the parameters for a CARICOM Fisheries Agreement that is based on a decision by CARICOM Heads of Government. Scotland notes that the rationale for the fisheries draft agreement stems in part from an understanding that certain living marine resources which are relied upon for food and livelihood are highly migratory, straddle national boundaries, and are also harvested by fishers other than those of the CARICOM Region without any benefit flowing to States of the Caribbean or to the Region as a whole. This reality, he asserts, obliges the beneficiaries of the living marine and aquatic resources of the Caribbean Region to band together, to pool their abilities and resources in order to more efficiently and effectively develop, manage and conserve the living marine and aquatic resources of the Caribbean Region.

Dr Scotland also presents a brief overview of the issues related to the fish species that populate the waters shared by Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago. In this regard, he explains the need for collaboration in order to ensure an efficient and sustainable management and conservation system, adding that it should be consistent with the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention.

Dr Trotz posits that environmental change can have a negative impact on low-lying coastal and island states that include many CARICOM countries. Noting that we are already vulnerable to the ravages of hurricanes, floods, landslides, drought, water and vector borne diseases, as well as the destruction of mangroves, reefs, wetlands and infrastructure, Dr Trotz outlines what is being undertaken to raise awareness and build capacity through education at the University of the West Indies. Above all, he advocates that policymakers need to become more proactive in this difficult but important regional and worldwide concern, given that the Caribbean has natural resources that can be employed in a more efficient and practical manner.
Regional integration in the Caribbean has always had an implicit security dimension. Dr Jessica Byron discusses this in her Paper noting that since 1973 a number of regional institutions have evolved to provide responses to national security, dispute settlement and conflict management initiatives. She addresses a conceptual framework for security governance in her analysis of CARICOM’s role in fostering regional cooperation.

Mr Hilton McDavid argues that CARICOM security can be based on an institutional structure that is similar to what has been used by the Caribbean Regional Negotiation Machinery, noting that it should be supported by a pool of trained mediators and conciliators, instead of it being managed by Heads of Government as a first line operation by them. He presents the recent cases of effective regional security in relation to World Cup Cricket and the Summit of the Americas, where all aspects of the security system were tested without any catastrophic failure being detected. He, nevertheless, laments the absence of a cohesive regional security strategy that is targeted at eliminating regional threats and acknowledges that an efficient regional security system is a requirement for economic stability and development.

Meanwhile, a CARICOM security system must have, among other attributes, the support of a legal framework and a transportation network. On the subject of a regional transportation network, Natasha George provides an important perspective on the airline industry. She argues that air travel in CARICOM is important, as it provides significant revenue and employment opportunities regionally otherwise without it, not only is the tourism industry dead, but the economies of the Caribbean will be in a serious downward spiral at a time when EU subsidies and preferences have ended. Yet evidence suggests that the air travel industry is not a stable and financially viable operation, due to a number of factors, including its fragmentation, instead of its integration, where almost every CARICOM country wanted to have its own flag carrier. Ms. George presents an alternative approach in which she explores whether elements of the European Air Transport Model can be modified for CARICOM purposes. She also supports creating a CARICOM Single Aviation Area and Air Space, asserting that such an area would create market opportunities for the aviation industry, strengthening thereby the CARICOM integration movement.

In relation to the legal framework, Justice Duke Pollard examines CARICOM treaty practice as compared with that of advanced economies. He focuses on some of the problems associated with multilateral treaties, and begins his discussion with the treaty practice of the United Kingdom. He draws attention to the fact that in CARICOM many ratified treaties remain unimplemented, being honoured more in the breach than in the observance. This could be a result
of limited human and financial resources resulting in uneven experiences and fragmentation. In fact, he notes some CARICOM countries do not have lawyers who are trained in international law, rendering thereby less than the optimal responses to concerns that may arise, and points to a number of CARICOM cases where lapses have occurred. That greater attention has to be paid to this area of Treaties and their obligations is certainly an area where policy makers need to allocate more resources to ensure a unified approach is adopted in CARICOM.

Interspersed throughout this publication are commentaries and arguments for having a more positive role for the Diaspora in the regional integration process and in the Community’s management of its external relations. Professor Hunte makes the point that Caribbean Development cannot be successful without the contribution of the Diaspora, as it provides the Community with simultaneous links to almost every available cultural, economic, religious, technological and economic setting. In his view, the potential of the Diaspora is enormous and irreplaceable and can no longer be peripheral to the Diplomatic process. Consequently, the role of the Diaspora in CARICOM Foreign Policy is a crucial component in any successful foreign policy framework—a viewpoint supported by Dr Riyad Insanally as he addresses the role of the Diaspora in contributing to the lobbying efforts for the Sugar Lobby in 2004-2006.

The paper by Dr Herisse also addresses the concerns and contribution of the Diaspora, describing the governance structure and accountability requirements for the Diaspora Political Action Committees (PAC), a critical institutional mechanism required for interfacing with the political process in North America. These examples of the positive input of the Diaspora can no longer be peripheral to CARICOM cause, for to do so would result in missed opportunities that traditional diplomatic services cannot provide.

This brief introduction has some of the core concerns and issues that have negatively impacted CARICOM states and particularly diplomatic efforts that depend ever so much on an integrated foreign policy to meet the challenges of the 21st century. These challenges cover a wide spectrum of concerns and it is up to all CARICOM citizens, including the institutions that represent them, and those in the Diaspora committed to the success of the regional integration movement, to begin the process of finding a new path that seeks to end insularity and extend the process of coordination and cooperation.
Note