The case for a North American community
By David Crane

SANTA FE, N.M. - WHEN THE foreign ministers of the three North American nations met here recently for their third ministerial summit, their goal was to seek ways to develop a North American partnership or, as Canada's Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy put it, a North American community.

And last week, in Ottawa and Montreal, young people in their 20s from Mexico, the United States and Canada attended a youth conference to talk about the future of North America, focusing on culture, sustainable development and governance.

Other efforts, such as green trans-
Building a North American Partnership

*Statement Agreed by U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, Mexican Foreign Secretary Rosario Green, and Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy, September 1999, New York, NY*

The North American partnership is becoming a reality, as the economies and societies of Canada, the United States and Mexico grow increasingly interdependent. Transboundary trade, culture, travel, family ties and cyber-space bring our societies ever closer together. North Americans share bonds of geography, culture and history. Our strength as a North American partnership resides in democracy, transparency, plurality and healthy economic conditions that provide for longer-term growth prospects and ensure that none of our citizens are left behind.

A great deal of trilateral cooperation already exists among our communities, local and national governments, businesses, universities and cultural institutions. The way we confront natural disasters in a coordinated fashion, for example, represents the kind of cooperative approach that we aim to encourage in other aspects of our relationship. All three of our countries face specific problems -- such as environmental degradation, climate change, organized crime and narcotics trafficking -- that can only be addressed through common understanding and dialogue that will build confidence, foster cooperation and enhance human security.

We as Ministers of Foreign Affairs will support and promote new and existing cooperative efforts, building on the solid foundation of our sovereignty and of our current partnership, while preserving that which makes our nations unique, to make of our diversity a shared source of strength. Today, societies and cultures are coming together as never before. As we exchange ideas, knowledge and skills, we learn that our common challenges can often be met with common solutions. We are committed to working together to address trilateral, regional and global issues where we share goals, interests and agendas.

Through mutual understanding, trust and commitment, our peoples are poised to enter a new era of cooperation -- an era of social and economic progress upon which we shall build our prosperity.

*For more on the North American Partnership as envisioned by the Three North American Foreign Ministers Visit their website - http://www.state.gov/www/regions/wha/uscanmex_trilat/index.html*

The contents of the Web page are also available in hard copy.

(Continued from page 1)

North American Free Trade Agreement, for example. The institute also convened one of the first three-nation forums on education and training in the increasingly integrated North American society and marketplace.

In seminars and in publications, this "think tank" has done much during the past decade to advance the notion of a North American community - linked not only by commerce and immigration, but also by cultural interchange and cooperative health and education projects.

The tri-national events of this weekend have drawn deserved international attention to the work of the North American Institute - and to its long dedication to ideas transcending our continent's borders.

*Reprinted with permission from the Santa Fe New Mexican The New Mexican Editorial 8/13/2000*
Los Alamos Fire Offers a Lesson in Humility
By William de-Boys
The Cerro Grande fire in the Jemez Mountains of northern New Mexico blackened 42,869 acres, destroyed the homes of 400 families, and penetrated the security of Los Alamos National Laborato-
ries more effectively than any Cold War enemy. In much the same way that the Cerro Grande restarted ecological succession on the scorched slopes above Los Alamos, it has also set the stage for a new succession of ideas about fire.

It will take years for these ideas to settle out, just as it will take years for those who lost their homes to feel that life has returned to normal. Land managers as well as the townspeople of Los Alamos will mark time by the fire: they will think of pre-Cerro Grande as one world, post-Cerro Grande another.

And all of us in the greater community of northern New Mexico will remember the crisis in complicated ways. We'll remember the heroism and stamina of firefighters, especially that of the Santa Fe Hotshots and the Los Alamos Fire Department, who fought valiantly to defend home ground. We'll remember the taste of ash and smoke, the sifting of ashes, the indelible images of pain and destruction. We'll re-
member the outpouring of generosity: people taking in strangers as well as friends, donating services, cash, and goods, finding ways to help. We'll reflect with gratitude on the remarkable wealth of American society – that we can absorb so devastating a loss and come back strong.

And no less, we will remember the anger the flames released and the all-too-human impulse to blame quickly and punish dramatically, to "make heads roll." It is said that for every complex question there exists a simple, easily understood and completely erro-
nneous answer. Such answers have sprouted like radishes from the ashes of Cerro Grande. One must hope that better, more useful crops will soon germinate. What follows is intended as a kind of factual mulch. Use liberally or not at all. See what comes up.

Consider this: The prescribed fire widely credited as the cause of the conflagration probably wasn't. What sent embers and flames scudding before the wind on a destructive path toward Los Alamos seems to have been a backfire set to contain the prescribed burn. Later evaluations suggest that a backfire was unnecessary and that the prescribed burn would have been contained without it. But the decision to ignite the back burn (made by whom is not clear) came in the heat of battle.

There is nothing exculpatory in this: lighting the prescribed fire was an error, and a bad one. But the deeper one delves into the chain of actions unleashing the fire, the better one understands how effects can cascade from small acts, how easily things might have turned out differently. Some even argue that the ill effects of the backfire had been contained, when one lone snag candled up, flared in the wind, and ... "For want of a nail, the shoe was lost, and for want of a shoe, the horse ..."

But it was not contingencies that worried the fire managers of Bandelier National Monument; it was inevitabil-
ity. They may have overestimated their powers and underestimated the uncertainties of fire and weather, but such hubris explains only part of their decision to proceed with the burn.

An acute sense of urgency and dedication explains the rest. The fire managers quite rightly viewed the over-
dense, fuel-heavy forests above Los Alamos as a bomb set to explode. One of the likeliest triggers was the upper reach of Frijoles Canyon, a tinderbox that lay within Bandelier. The targeted burn area of Cerro Grande lay directly upslope. In order to establish a decent fire boundary, they had to burn Cerro Grande before they could burn upper Frijoles, and they had to burn Frijoles before superintendent Roy Weaver re-
tired, possibly as early as next year.

Under Weaver, Bandelier had become a showcase of progressive eco-
logical management. He and his team had restored extensive ponderosa sa-
vannas and maintained them with fire; on an experimental basis, they'd stabi-
ized rapidly eroding piñon-juniper sites with mechanical treatments, even in a wilderness area. They'd assembled a dedicated and aggressive prescribed-
fire crew. The next superintendent was unlikely to have Weaver's vision or his nerve, and so to save Los Alamos, the work had to move forward while he was still on watch.

The irony and tragedy embedded here need no embellishment. Skiers are taught not to look at the danger they wish to avoid but to focus on their path to safety. The Bandelier team was like a skier who could not take his eyes off a tree - and crashed into it.

Only a dramatist with a Sopho-
clean turn of mind would have pre-
dicted the particular choreography of the crash, but the crash itself fit a long-es
established and obvious pattern. Con-
sider for a moment the present condi-
tion of the east slope of the Jemez range: Starting in the south and pro-
ceeding north along more or less constant elevations, we have the Dome Fire (c. 16,500 acres in 1996), which adjoins the La Mesa Fire (15,444 acres in 1977) which adjoins the Cerro Grande Fire (nearly 43,000 acres in 2000) which adjoins the Oso Complex Fire, (6,508 acres in 1998). The cumu-
labative effect of these powerful fires, amplified by additional stand-changing burns on the southern slopes of the Jemez in the 1970s, has been to destroy the continuous belt of ponderosa pine that used to wrap around the east side of the mountains. Those who feed on irony can fatten here: The lumber-rich pine zone was the most economically valuable ecosystem in the range, and so it received the lion's share of manage-
ment attention and resources. In fact, the central goal of a century of forest management in the Jemez Mountains was to protect and enhance the pine zone - yet the result of management, in this most flammable portion of the range, has been to destroy it.

(Continued on page 4)
The physical culprits are well known: grazing, which removed the fuels that powered forest-thinning light burns, and fire suppression combined to jack up stand densities. The fire-starved pine zone shrank as piñon and juniper crept upslope and mixed conifer species crept down. Logging probably accelerated both trends; by removing big trees, it speeded establishment of over-dense, weedy cohorts. These were not accidental outcomes. The ultimate culprit was a way of thinking: the impulse to simplify.

Scientific forestry and the idea of land management developed from a view of the world and of nature that was mechanical. If a factory was a big machine, a forest was a bigger one. The same scientific principles that rendered assembly lines more productive would also make the machine of nature more efficient. The first thing to do was to eliminate waste and superfluous movement.

By removing unneeded parts: floods in rivers, fresh water flowing to the sea, bark beetles and budworms, predators, prairie dogs and other varmints, even porcupines. Especially get rid of fire because it is disorderly and kills trees, which are the output we cherish.

We've learned from that experience. We've learned that when we try to maximize production of a single variable from a complex system, we destabilize the system. Whether the cherished output is codfish, board-feet of timber, or Animal Unit Months of grass, the system tends to crash. In theory, an obsessive effort to maximize output of an endangered species would be no different.

In recent decades we traded our mechanical model for a systems view, and glimpsed a partial answer: We should look beyond the individual variables. Ecosystems are too complex for us to attend to every part, even if we could count all of them, which we can't. But if we focus instead on the keystone processes that structure the systems, the variables tend to take care of themselves. The natural flow regime of a river, including periodic floods, is such a process. Fire pre-eminently is another. Every thinking land manager from the burn team at Bandelier to Bruce Babbitt has known this truth: We've got to return fire to its native ecosystems. We've got to do it for ecosystem health, no less than for prevention of catastrophic events. When the water squeeze of multi-year drought again hits us, we'll say we need to do it for water yield.

The necessity of fire is a relatively new realization, and the instrument of choice for its reintroduction, prescribed burning, is a relatively new tool. Cerro Grande has heightened attention to its limitations, and they are significant. First, the risks of prescribed fire in heavy fuels are great, maybe too great to be acceptable most of the time. Fire is the embodiment of uncertainty, and playing with it is just what mama said it was.

Second, the scale of prescribed fire required to address landscape needs is many times greater than our capacity to provide it. Consider the alignment of stars a burn boss on public land must achieve: archaeological clearance, interagency consultation on threatened and endangered species, environmental analysis, survival of appeals, clean air permit, crew and equipment availability, weather window. A thousand-acre burn can take a year or more of preparation and may cost more than $20 per acre. Even then its chances of occurring in optimal conditions are slim. The additional supervisory review that is sure to be required in the aftermath of Cerro Grande will further encumber the process. Within the existing management paradigm, we will never fully offset, let alone reduce, the accumulation of fuel.

Third, the disaster of Cerro Grande has put the fear of God in every fire boss in the West. Cerro Grande's practical effect, irrespective of policy changes, will be to close the hotter part of the burn window. Managers will meet their acreage objectives by turning landscapes temporarily black with mild, cool treatments. Rarely will they torch off a burn hot enough to reduce hazard fuel substantially, much less achieve ecological effect.

The chainsaw, on surface, offers an alternative to the use of prescribed fire, and the years ahead will be noisy with debate over what kinds of mechanical treatments to use and how intensively and extensively to use them. Profferers of simple answers may want to exercise care here: Logging and thinning slash have helped launch many a crown fire. In a sane world, people would speak of tree cutting not as a substitute for prescribed fire but as a partner to it.

Nevertheless, the debates will rage, and it will be interesting to see if anyone acknowledges the 600-pound gorilla frowning in the background of every discussion.

That gorilla is our ignorance. We don't have complete answers to the conundrums we face. We really have not learned how to live in this place. Our land-management infrastructure (in which I include environmental and industry interests) is presently incapable of dealing effectively with the fuel and fire challenge. This inability is perfectly mirrored by the sustained lunacy of mortgagors, insurance companies, and the general citizenry.

How else should we characterize subdivisions and second homes in the piney woods - frame houses with shake or tar-based roofs, pine straw lawns, and doghair yards? Enforcement of a fire-savvy building code might have cut the losses in Los Alamos by half, but a

(Continued on page 8)
The Camino Real Trade Corridor
by John D. Wirth

Santa Teresa, the new border crossing between the states of Chihuahua and New Mexico, will soon become the site of a planned city in tandem with San Geronimo, its Mexican counterpart. In the next decade or so, these twin cities may draw as many as half a million people to the area. New highway links are already in place, feeding into a multi-modal transportation hub on the New Mexico side. Rail connections linking either the Burlington Northern Santa Fe or the Union Pacific with a Mexican spur line are likely to follow soon. It seems that enough water exists in the Mesilla Bolson to support this projected growth, whereas the existing Ciudad Juarez-El Paso metropole is already facing water shortages along with severe congestion and pollution from heavy truck traffic. Thus the opportunity to match up existing resources with new opportunities should be explored, along with the development of a trade corridor from Albuquerque to Chihuahua City and beyond named after the historic Camino Real that once connected our two states.

The New Mexico Department
(Continued on page 7)

There is not a hidden agenda to create a North American version of the European Union with its top-down government, he insisted. Instead, the ministers want to facilitate and support civil society and the private sector to develop relationships.

But there's also a defensive element in his advocacy of a North American community. Canada has been burned by U.S. efforts to control illegal immigration, and U.S. concerns that drug traffickers, organized crime and terrorists are entering the United States through Canada and Mexico.

``We need to examine where we can find common approaches to drug trafficking and crime, rather than building barriers to each other,'' Axworthy says.

This is quite different from support for a new common currency in North America, or adoption by all three countries of the U.S. dollar, or a movement to a common market with common external tariffs and the free movement of people.

But whether or not a North American community will emerge remains an open question. In Canada, for example, there is already uneasiness over the influence of the U.S. in Canadian life, while at the same time, there is little historical connection between Canada and Mexico.

Canadians are accustomed to dealing with Canada-U.S. relations while Mexicans are accustomed to dealing with Mexico-U.S. relations. Likewise, Canadians can learn to live with the shallow integration that results from freer trade. But it's not clear that Canadians want deep integration with their neighbors to the south, since this would be seen as a clear threat to Canadian sovereignty and independence, given the overwhelming size and power of the U.S.

Yet, the existence of a growing commercial relationship is going to lead to a greater number of ties in other areas, including the environment, energy, water, transportation, human security and immigration, for example.

How these relationships will be managed remains to be seen. What Axworthy and his fellow foreign ministers are saying is that it is time to start talking about North America as more than just a trade bloc.

(David Crane is a columnist for the Toronto Star, and a long time NA-MISTA. This article has been republished with his permission.)
By John D. Wirth
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Strong started in the Alberta oil patch, and has made energy his primary focus ever since, the latest venture being a partnership with Stephan Schmidheiny, the Swiss business visionary, to develop environmentally friendly fuel products. Along the way he also ran two crown corporations, Petro Canada for the federal liberals under Pierre Trudeau, and Ontario Hydro during the premiership of the NDP's Bob Rae. A less nimble player than Strong might well have foundered while shooting any one of these corporate rapids and the tricky politics. Restless by nature, he always knew when to change course, invariably choosing not calmer waters but a return to public service before yet another bout with business.

How does Maurice do it? This book, part memoir and part essay, reveals an early capacity for charting goals, surrounding himself with able subordinates, while almost immediately preparing a successor. Along the way he developed a talent for moving, re-forming and energizing complex organizations, based on ambitious but realistic expectations. "I have always had the habit of working on paper," he writes, "dictating into a mini-cassette recorder to produce drafts that I can then review and massage. Whenever I embark on a new project, I like to set out in memorandum form the basic elements and structure of the project. There are inevitably many blank spaces and holes, of course, but it helps me organize my own thoughts and elicit the input of others." (p. 291). Here Strong's zest for networking comes into play. The book is studded with names, not just the who's but how he worked with them and to what ends.

To be sure, what to Strong may be common sense flexibility can strike others as being altogether too nimble, as when this professor environmentalist became CEO of Hydro, which was heavily into nuclear power, demonstrating once again to critics his "soft and eccentric environmentalism."


The rejoinder is that in shaking up Hydro's management Strong built sustainability into its operations, demonstrating once again the truism that good environmental management is good management.

Public service, the other major theme of his career, is squarely in the tradition of Canadian internationalism. Punctuated by frequent tours of duty at the UN, Strong has moved from an early and effective manager of Canadian development assistance directed to the third World to becoming a leading voice for cooperative internationalism. Particularly interesting is his extensive coverage on the environment, including the landmark conferences at Stockholm (1972), Rio (1992) and Rio +5, the follow-up that failed to produce results. In all these initiatives to define and advance the environment Strong played major roles. Efforts to expand the role and authority of the UN's environmental programs have not, so far, produced results, but his advocacy of NGOs and opening space for the new voices in civil society has helped to change the way international organizations including the World Bank deal with emerging new constituencies.

The book begins with a call to arms to address climate change and the fundamental fact of the environmental challenge, to which public policy can and must respond. It ends with a long essay section on governance issues. Is the nation-state still relevant? Strong laments early on that cross-border linkages may be weakening it irrevocably, but in the concluding section advocates a role for government at all levels, following the principle of subsidiarity. Canadian unity is lightly touched upon. Strong holds the U.S. to high standards, but never scolds. After all, as a green card holder he is a player in the U.S. as well.

Today many exceptional North Americans are replicating Strong's meteoric start. In 1951, he writes, "I was twenty-two. I had a good job with a growing oil company and was well positioned for promotion. I had made a small fortune. Yes, I was doing well, but...." In addressing their own "butts," who among these dotcomers will achieve such a varied and productive career?

In conclusion, a personal note: Maurice Strong was a founder of the North American Institute in 1988, and later he headed the evaluation committee which affirmed and endorsed the work of the Nafta Commission for Environmental Cooperation on which I serve. Both NAMI and the CEC operate on the principal of cooperative internationalism to which Strong is so fully and effectively committed.
of Environment hosted and NAMI Co-sponsored the first meeting of stakeholders from both sides of the border at Santa Teresa on May 26. Along with Governor Gary Johnson, several state and local government officials attended. Former B.C. premier Michael Harcourt of NAMI-Canada gave the keynote.

Building on the interest and momentum generated at this Santa Teresa meeting, NAMI is convinced that the State of New Mexico has a unique opportunity to create something from the ground up using the trade corridor approach in conjunction with the planned border cities. Much can be learned from the other, existing trade corridors in North America—learning from their best practices while hopefully avoiding their mistakes. Explosive growth is coming, spurred by the new border crossing, increased trade flows; the jobs created by the maquila industry on the Chihuahua side of the border; and by warehousing, multimodal services and subdivisions on the new Mexico side. But as yet no group or agency has taken the lead to develop a vision of the whole.

Thanks to a recent grant from the McCune Foundation, NAMI has funding to convene a series of workshops dealing with aspects of the new trade corridor. The first would ascertain whether stakeholders are interested in developing a regional approach to transportation and related growth and environmental issues. Can competing interests and communities along the new trade corridor find common ground? As well, these workshops should help to develop lines of communication among the stakeholders. Future workshops can explore such issues as coordinating transportation modes, meeting the environmental challenge, and developing land use options.

In conjunction with these workshops, NAMI is prepared to help identify and develop a task force of leaders from the business, public and non-profit sectors to advise the two Governors on trade corridor issues. It may also be possible to spearhead the development of a formal trade corridor organization.

NEW FACES AT NAMI

Ian Burns, NAMI's Office Manager, has been on the job since May. He also takes on the role of NAMI News editor and helps to maintain the website. A graduate of Wesleyan University in Connecticut where he majored in economics, Ian hails from Massachusetts and has just switched his residence to New Mexico.

Shalie Gasper, a former staff member at Cornerstones, Community Partnerships and an Americorps veteran will coordinate the North American Community Service program. A member of Zuni Pueblo, Shalie will be at NAMI for about 9 months before going on to earn her MLA degree in landscape architecture.

NAMI-Canada has a new home in Edmonton, Alberta and a new Chair: Brian Stevenson, former chief of staff to Minister Lloyd Axworthy is now Vice President for International Affairs at the University of Alberta. Brian, a Canadian, was raised in Mexico and has taught at ITAM, the home of NAMI-Mexico.

David Griscom has left the Associate Directorship to pursue a business career. Having superbly managed four NAMI meetings, including, most recently, coordinating with the trinational ministerial in Santa Fe, David continues his interest in trade corridors and will serve as a consultant to NAMI.

Don Winkelmann joined the NAMI Board in 1995 and the Executive Committee in 1999. Prior to arriving in Santa Fe in 1995 he lived for nearly 30 years in Mexico. Most of those years were with CIMMYT, an agricultural research center working internationally, where Winkelmann first headed the Economics Program and then served ten years as the Director. The not-for-profit Center's staff of some 1200 focuses on improving maize and wheat production in developing countries, where the two crops are of critical importance.

From 1995 to 2000 Winkelmann was the Chairman of a Technical Advisory Committee, which is responsible for framing priorities, recommending resource allocations, and assessing the quality and relevance of the science for 16 international centers, including CIMMYT, with a combined annual budget of $350m.

Within NAMI, Winkelmann's primary programmatic concern is the role of civil society and social capital as these influence policy and program discussions, especially those dealing with the environment and trade corridors.

Finally, Professor Edward Harvey of the University of Toronto is Executive Director of the trinational Alliance for Higher Education and Enterprise in North America, a program with which NAMI is closely associated. A Steering Committee comprised of David Strangway, John Wirth, and Rafael Fernandes de Castro is advising Ted Harvey on the venture.
town that leads the world in Ph.Ds per capita never thought the matter through. Good luck to the rest of us.

If we were to acknowledge the gorilla of our ignorance, we might start by putting aside the language of "land management." We rarely manage; we mostly shove and bludgeon, or we walk away. A few noteworthy individuals have learned to nudge, and go with the flow, and if the rest of us wanted to be like them, we would approach every land treatment as an experiment, and we would experiment explicitly with different approaches in different places. We would monitor everything. We would expect to be surprised. We would become compulsive learners.

---

Reprinted with permission from William deBuys and High Country News.
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