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ABSTRACT

In September 2017 nature’s terror was unleashed in parts of the Caribbean as hurricanes Irma and Maria destroyed lives and ruined property. This paper seeks to draw attention to the severity of natural disasters for small-island developing states and the implications for regionalism and development. Theoretically grounded in comparative politics and regional integration studies, the paper probes a central question: taking as the point of departure the devastation caused by hurricanes Irma and Maria in the independent and non-independent Caribbean in 2017, how can the relationship between sovereignty, security and regionalism be reconceptualised to inform praxis? The central argument is that, the intensity and severity of natural disasters expose fault lines in traditional notions of sovereignty and security and create intellectual and policy space to reconceptualise regionalism for small-island developing states. A major recommendation is that climate change provides impetus for new regionalism, strengthened bi-regionalism and global leadership to promote human security.

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary world ‘order’ is in flux. The persistent crisis in Syria has led to severe human suffering that has spilled over beyond the Syrian borders. The election of Donald Trump as president of the United States (US) has ushered in a moment of hyper nationalism, the tendency toward American isolationism and grave uncertainty for global peace and security. Developments within the European Union (EU), such as Brexit and the constitutional debacle over the secession of the Spanish region of Catalonia throws light on issues of sovereignty, democracy and globalisation. Importantly, as globalisation accelerates, new threats emerge, and old dangers are intensified globally. Threats such as global crime, human trafficking, financial market instability and contagion (the spread of capital market collapse and sudden threats that can have extensive impact on the economy and people’s lives), threats to job security (through global economic restructuring), the spread of diseases and conflict within national borders perpetuate human (in)security (Fukuda-Parr, 2004, 3).

For countries in the Global South, such as in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), the current wave of globalisation has exacerbated old problems even as new issues come to the fore. Developmental challenges such as poverty, inequality, unemployment and high levels of debt persist. According to the World Bank (2017) “The Latin America and Caribbean region (LAC) seems to have turned the corner: after six years of slowdown, including two of recession, it is growing again. However, the years of economic stagnation have halted social progress, and the region needs to spur the economic recovery and find new engines of growth to reduce poverty and boost prosperity further.” However, a multiplicity of security threats continues to stymie
development efforts, such as the illicit drug trade and its attendant violence and criminality, pandemics, such as HIV/AIDS, food (in)security and the effects of climate change. In fact, in 2017 the severity and intensity of hurricanes and volcanoes (the latter particularly in Mexico) seem to suggest that climate change is a clear and present danger that requires urgent action at multiple levels.

This paper does not set out to interrogate the debate on climate change per se. The purpose of the paper is to specifically analyse the significance of hurricanes Irma and Maria on the independent and non-independent Caribbean and propose policy recommendations to address the problem. Methodologically, this is a qualitative study that explores issues related to complex security, compromised sovereignty and choppy regionalism. It uses data obtained from secondary sources, such as speeches from government and other officials, official documents emanating from government offices, regional institutions and international organisations, press releases, and newspaper articles, among other secondary sources. Following this introduction, the paper discusses theoretical insights to shed light on the problem. It then analyses key findings and their implications, presents conclusions and finally offers policy recommendations.

THEORETICAL INSIGHTS

The critical problem focuses on the devastation caused by hurricanes Irma and Maria in the independent and non-independent Caribbean and the implications for theory and praxis. This section explores three interrelated concepts: sovereignty, security and regionalism.

Sovereignty

In the study of International Relations (IR) ‘[t]he concept of ‘sovereignty’ is usually taken to mean that a nation state has power and control over its own future ... A loss of sovereignty implies a loss of legal and actual control over the determination of the direction of national policy’” (Held 1990, 407 cited in Rudolph 2005, 3). However, as globalisation intensified the concept of sovereignty became fiercely debated (Barrow-Giles 2003; Harvey 2005; Krasner 2009; Bishop and Payne 2010; Joseph 2011). As Premdas observes, “new actors have proliferated in the international arena of the contemporary international system, some affirming the jurisdiction of state sovereignty, others undermining it” (Premdas 2002, 50). Rudolph (2005) contends that “Patterns of trade and capital flows provide a strong argument that the global economy readily transcends national boundaries. In contrast, other scholars observe that the globalisation of migration flows has served to increase the importance of territoriality as a central component of sovereignty and as an ordering principle in world politics (Albert, Jacobson and Lapid 2001 cited in Rudolph 2005, 2). Krasner (1999) argues that Westminster is compromised given ‘sovereignty bargains and trade-offs’. However, Watson (2013) maintains that it is necessary to re-think the sovereignty paradigm away from the state-centric framework.

Given global uncertainty, shrinking state resources and security dilemmas, governments are forced to engage in deeper multilateralism and regionalism. This is reinforced by legal treaties that are ratified by sovereign states and adjudicated by regional/international courts that are established by states. However, as states become more embedded in systems of global and regional governance, territoriality and autonomy are compromised, bringing to the fore the perennial tension between regionalism and nationalism. The question is, to what extent can sovereignty
coexist with economic integration and democracy. For Rodrik (2007), the ‘inescapable trilemma of the world economy is that democracy, national sovereignty and global economic integration are mutually incompatible. He argues that we can combine any two of the three, but never have all three simultaneously and in full. For Haass (2017), unlike the Westphalian order, global politics has now entered a “World Order 2.0” where borders are forcibly violated, given common threats. Beyond rights and autonomy, Haass argues for sovereign obligations of states, to include the fight against terrorism, cooperation on climate change and global health. Here, the discussion on sovereignty is intricately linked to the broadened discourse on security.

Security

Security is a highly contested concept. So-called ‘mainstream’ security studies distinguish between ‘high’ and ‘low’ politics. For Walt (1991, 212), security is “the study of the threat, use and control of military force, especially of specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent or engage in war.” However, since the end of the Cold War there is an ongoing debate that is reshaping the security discourse. It is argued that the traditional focus on military security is no longer adequate on its own to explain non-military threats. According to Krause and Williams (1996, 229-230) these debates have three roots: a discontent among some scholars with the neorealist foundations that have characterised the field, a need to respond to the challenges posed by the emergence of a post-Cold War security order, and a continuing desire to make the discipline relevant to contemporary concerns. Wideners attempt to go beyond the neorealist conception of security to include a wider range of potential threats, ranging from economic and environmental issues to human rights and migration (Ullman 1983; Matthews 1989, Buzan et al 2004). As Paris (2001) argues, these efforts to reconceptualise security have been prompted in part by contributions of critical theorists including feminist, postmodernists and constructivists. Within this expanded notion of security, the concept of human security gained currency. The first major reference to human security was made in the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report. The report identified seven elements of human security:

(1) Economic security - an assured basic income for individuals, usually from productive and remunerative work, or, in the last resort, from some publicly financed safety net;
(2) Food security - ensuring that people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food;
(3) Health security - access to health care and protection from diseases;
(4) Environmental security - protecting people from the short-and long-term ravages of nature, man-made threats in nature, and deterioration of the natural environment;
(5) Personal security - physical safety from such things as torture, war, criminal attacks, domestic violence, drug use, suicide and traffic accidents;
(6) Community security - survival of traditional cultures and ethnic groups as well as the physical security of these groups; and
(7) Political security - enjoyment of civil and political rights and freedom from political oppression.
For the UNDP (1994), the concept of security “has for too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust…Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives” (United Nations Development Program, 1994, 22). Attempts to broaden and deepen the neorealist concept of security have met with intense criticism. Critics argue that broadening and deepening of security makes the field intellectually incoherent and practically irrelevant (Dorff 1994; Mearsheimer 1994, 1995). Mearsheimer (1995,92) contends that alternative approaches have provided neither a clear explanatory framework for analysing security nor demonstrated their value in concrete research. Walt (1991, 213) observes that the adoption of alternative conceptions is not only analytically mistaken but politically irresponsible (cited in Krause and Williams 1996, 230). As Paris (2001, 90) notes, the UNDP’s list is so broad that it is difficult to determine what, if anything, might be excluded from the definition of human security. Nonetheless, for small-island developing states, this broadened reconceptualisation of security is critical. Furthermore, compromised sovereignty and human (in)security make regionalism a necessary imperative for small developing states. In fact, the concept of regional security complexes throw light on the intersection of security and regionalism. This refers to,

Regional sub-systems consisting of a set of states whose major security perceptions and concerns are so inter-linked that their national security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another (Buzan et al, 1998, 198).

Regionalism

Similar to sovereignty and security, regionalism is a contested concept. The discourse on regionalism has evolved through three waves: The first wave drew on functionalism/neofunctionalism and concentrated on the inception of European integration. The second utilised inter-governmentalism to explain the lull in European integration in the 1960s and 70s. The third wave begun in the late 1980s to the present and includes open regionalism and the New Regionalism approach (Hettne and Söderbaum 2000; Hettne 2005). New Regionalism refers to a situation where “State, market, civil society and external actors often come together in a variety of mixed-actor collectivities, networks and modes of regional governance” (Söderbaum and Shaw 2003 cited in Hettne 2005, 555). At the core of New Regionalism are the concepts of security and development regionalism (Hettne et al, 2001).

Whither regionalism in the contemporary era? There is no doubt that the European Union (EU) is the most advanced regional integration scheme in the world. McCormick (2014) provides a concise introduction to the workings of the EU. However, since the Euro Zone crisis many scholars have critiqued European integration and have questioned its viability (see for example Bootle 2014 and Majone 2014). Importantly, on 23 June 2016, 52 percent of British citizens voted in a referendum to leave the EU while 48 percent voted to remain. This is a watershed moment in world politics and has far reaching implications for the UK, the EU and the rest of the world. The UK’s proposed exit from the EU brings to the fore contradictions of regionalism, paradoxes of democracy and the contentious issue of sovereignty (Grenade 2016). The current problem in the EU is further complicated by recent developments within Spain given Catalonia’s secession bid. I propose that in this moment of global flux, we may be entering into a fourth wave of regionalism post Brexit; a moment based on spill back and reversal as the EU battles its own internal storms.
This is not desirable for individual states or the global community. It is within the context of this global moment of flux that this paper discusses the devastation caused by hurricanes Irma and Maria in the Caribbean.

**NATURE’S TERROR IN THE CARIBBEAN**

This section of the paper uses hurricanes Irma and Maria as the point of departure to discuss the intersection of security, sovereignty and regionalism in the Caribbean.

**Complex (In)Security**

The Caribbean can be classified as a Regional Security Complex, given its interwoven maze of (in)security. As small developing states, external and internal forces have converged to threaten the very survival of Caribbean states and peoples. For example, the negative impact of economic globalisation and the consequences of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), coupled with internal crises, have led to increased poverty and economic (in)security in countries such as Haiti and Guyana. Vulnerability to natural disasters, such as hurricanes, floods and volcanoes, have given rise to environmental (in)security in many Caribbean countries. The illicit drug trade and the accompanying violence and criminality have undermined societal security and order. Diseases such as HIV/AIDS are threatening livelihoods and productivity and have the potential to severely undermine human security and development. For the Caribbean, security is multi-dimensional and has never been viewed merely as protection from military threats. Instead it is viewed as “…protection and preservation of a people’s freedom from external military attack and coercion, from internal subversion and from the erosion of cherished political, economic and social values” Griffith (2003, 386). Within this framework, security becomes critical to survival, not only for the viability of the state but also for socio-economic development. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Heads of Government of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) have recognised security as the fourth pillar of the Community, “given its ever-increasing importance and its cross-cutting and fundamental nature.”¹

In the wake of the 2008 global financial and economic crisis, Caribbean economies were experiencing a sluggish recovery (Caribbean Development Bank, 2011). This meant in essence that, throughout the region, economic security was threatened. This gloomy economic forecast was compounded when two major hurricanes ripped through the region in September 2017, as a direct consequence of environmental (in)security. The first, hurricane Irma, was an extremely powerful and catastrophic hurricane, the strongest observed in the Atlantic since Wilma in 2005 in terms of maximum sustained winds. It was the first Category 5 hurricane to strike the Leeward Islands on record, followed by Hurricane Maria only two weeks later. It was also the most intense Atlantic hurricane to strike the United States since Katrina in 2005, and the first major hurricane to make landfall in Florida since Wilma in 2005. Irma caused widespread and catastrophic damage, particularly in parts of the north-eastern Caribbean and the Florida Keys (Charles, 2017).

---

¹ Communique issued at the Conclusion of the eighteenth Inter-Sessional Meeting of the Conference of Heads of Government of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), 12-14 February 2007, Kingstown, St. Vincent and the Grenadines.
According to CNN, when Hurricane Irma ravaged the island of Barbuda\(^2\) in the Caribbean, the ferocious storm "extinguished" the isle's way of life and left the beautiful spot "uninhabitable." And, now, for the first time in a few centuries, no one lives there. "The damage is complete," Ronald Sanders, the Antigua and Barbuda ambassador to the United States, told Public Radio International. "It's a humanitarian disaster." "For the first time in 300 years, there's not a single living person on the island of Barbuda -- a civilization that has existed in that is land for close to, over 300 years has now been extinguished."

Similarly, in the British Virgin Islands, hurricanes Irma and Maria spared no damage. The Guardian reported one resident as saying,

"Irma did a lot of damage but, for me, Maria finished the job," said Karon Brown, 29, a resident of Great Mountain on the island of Tortola.... "We already had flooding inside the house and lost most of our possessions in Irma. Before Maria came, we boarded the house up and tried to secure what remained. But Maria just ripped it all off – damaged the building more and destroyed most of what was left."\(^4\)

It is noteworthy that the Secretary-General of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) referred to hurricane Irma as a “nuclear hurricane.”\(^5\) In a similar vein, after the severe devastation of Dominica, (a country that was slowly recovering after the catastrophic impact of hurricane Erika in 2015), Prime Minister Roosevelt Skerrit, in an address to the UN General Assembly referred to Dominica as a “war zone.”\(^6\) Reports also revealed that “...Hurricane Irma devastated St. Martin, an island divided in two by the French and Dutch governments. The storm unleashed winds of a hundred and fifty-five miles per hour, thrashing homes, five-star resorts, and Princess Juliana Airport, … Government officials and aid groups reported that at least four people had been killed, two hundred others were missing, and seventy per cent of the buildings on St. Maarten, the Dutch side of the island, had been destroyed. At least ten deaths were reported on the French side. Seventy-seven thousand people live on the thirty-three-square-mile island, and some eighty percent of the labour force works in a tourism industry that has steadily grown for

\(^2\) Barbuda is a small island in the eastern Caribbean that forms part of the sovereign Commonwealth nation of Antigua and Barbuda. It is located to the north of Antigua in the middle of the Leeward Islands. As of September 2017, due to harsh weather conditions and massive destruction to the infrastructure of the island due to Hurricane Irma, the island of Barbuda has been abandoned. Most of its population of about 1,638 (at the 2011 Census) lived in the town of Codrington. Antigua and Barbuda became a sovereign nation on 1 November 1981 but remained part of the British Commonwealth and a constitutional monarchy. The island has since become a popular tourist destination because of its moderate climate and coastline.


four consecutive years as foreigners flock to the island year-round. This is an account of a resident on St. Martin in response to the reported security void:

Yes, there has been some crime, but it could be way worse, considering people are waiting a week to get a response. I don’t think the most vital information is that people are looting. Considering the economic climate on the island prior to the storm, you could understand why people are going crazy now, post-storm. You had to choose between buying water and a flashlight. Cost of living is so damn high, it’s crazy.

But there is a resilience of the St. Martin people, and they have come together and are working to maintain whatever, maintain hope. Whatever they can do together to move forward a little bit. We are helping clean each other’s yards, we’re sharing food, we’re sharing water. The people are coming together, and the people are working together to restore their country.

The above scenario brings to the fore the tension in the various dimensions of human security. In the midst of an economic crisis, an environment catastrophe threatened food security, undermined personal and health security. To what extent can sovereign states withstand nature’s terror? What is the relationship between human security and sovereignty in the context of unequal global power relations?

Small Developing States, Sovereignty and Unequal Global Power Relations

Given the Caribbean’s position in the global political economy, it exercises sovereignty in the context of unequal global power relations. This in turn has implications for human security in the context of nature’s terror. For example, Caribbean countries are not members of the OECD. Although such ‘global’ governance institutions do not have global composition in their membership, yet their rules have global reach and impact. The issue of graduation is a case in point. In his commentary The View from Europe, David Jessop reported that CARICOM’s Secretary-General, Irwin LaRocque, made clear that if the Caribbean is ever to be able to respond sustainably to the devastation caused by climate change, the eligibility criteria for development assistance must change. Speaking about this in Georgetown on the occasion of the accreditation of a new Austrian ambassador to CARICOM, Ambassador LaRoque observed that the regional institution had long advocated that access to development funds should not be based on the “grossly inadequate and inaccurate criterion” of GDP per capita. It was, he said, an approach that had resulted in the graduation of most CARICOM countries from accessing concessional financing. “We believe that this, as applied to Small Island Developing States (SIDS), must be changed as a matter of urgency to include the concept of vulnerability,” he remarked, before going on to urge CARICOM’s third country partners to lend strong support to its efforts to effect this

---


change. There was too, he suggested, an urgent need for international development partners to re-examine the criteria for access to resources such as the Green Climate Fund. Jessop goes on to explain that despite its multiple vulnerabilities and smallness, its variable levels of social and economic development, every Caribbean nation, apart from Haiti, has been graduated out of eligibility for low cost international development financing, as the average income of individuals in almost every nation is deemed to be too high. As Jessop notes, eligibility is decided by the OECD’s 30-member development assistance committee (DAC), which in three-year cycles determines, using World Bank figures, individual nation’s level of development. It is an approach that currently groups the Caribbean other than Haiti with other upper middle-income or high-income countries, seemingly for reasons of administrative convenience. It places, for example, Guyana or Dominica in the same category as China, and other Caribbean nations on a par with wealthy OECD members. This results in the loss of access to concessory financing, making capital for development more expensive. Put more practically, it means that the Caribbean is unlikely to ever achieve climate change resilience and economic stability if it cannot afford to address the damage caused by extreme weather events. In essence, global governance regimes must be democratised to enable SIDS to build resilience to natural disasters and other shocks which are becoming more intense.

The case of hurricanes Irma and Maria also threw light on some of the dynamics which underpin the non-independent Caribbean; the Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs) of the EU. A major problem for those ‘non-sovereign’ territories also relate to the question of graduation. It was reported that “Under international aid rules, Anguilla, Turks and Caicos and the British Virgin Islands are considered too wealthy to qualify for assistance.” The report noted that there are strict international rules on what officially counts as foreign aid. These are agreed upon by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris, of which Britain is a member. Beyond the question of graduation, hurricanes Irma and Maria exposed issues of citizenship, identity and belonging. Reports revealed the plight of a French women on St. Martin, who argued that, “We’re as French as anyone. We need help and there is no one here,” On the defensive after reports of looting, French officials announced one of the biggest airlifts since World War II. Additionally, given the grave devastation, food security was threatened. For example, reports showed a Dutch soldier armed with an automatic weapon standing guard alongside a food aid truck as hungry locals lined up for food aid. Again, there are clear linkages between the various elements of the UNDP’s human security framework. In fact, the occurrence of those natural

---

10 BBC News “BVI too rich to benefit from UK’s aid budget, report finds” September 14, 2017.
13 The Mail Online “Supermarkets crawling with MAGGOTS, looters ransacking shelves and families forced to live in a lifeboat tent: Terrifying footage shows chaos gripping Caribbean island of St Maarten after it was 'flattened' by 225mph hurricane Irma”. Accessed October 31, 2017.
disasters, suggests an interplay among military and non-military dimensions of security. As Sanders observes, “Hurricanes don’t only destroy properties and take lives, they also create unemployment and increase poverty – something that those who deny climate change and global warming need to understand.”

It is important to note that hurricanes Irma and Maria wreaked havoc on Caribbean islands, despite their diverse political systems and independent status. Nature’s terror did not discriminate based on sovereign boundaries or colonial ties. The community of peoples within independent and non-independent states alike were exposed to human insecurities. Solidarity and cooperation were critical since the Caribbean is a regional security complex.

**Choppy Regionalism**

Regionalism is a necessary imperative to achieve sustainable development among the small developing states in the Caribbean. However, Caribbean regionalism has been choppy, characterised by achievements and non-achievements. Established in 1973, the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) is for the most part (except for the Caribbean Court of Justice) an intergovernmental arrangement that rests on four pillars.

- Functional Cooperation
- Foreign Policy Coordination
- Security Cooperation
- Economic Integration

An assessment of CARICOM reveals a mixed score-card. In the area of functional cooperation, CARICOM has achieved relative successes, particularly in health, education, culture and sports. There have been moderate achievements in the realm of foreign policy coordination. Economic integration in CARICOM is gravely lacking, although there is much promise within the economic union of the sub-regional grouping of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean states (OECS) where a monetary union already exists. The most recent pillar which has been inserted into regional governance is security cooperation and the following institutions are central to the Caribbean’s security architecture:

- CARICOM Climate Change Centre
- CARICOM Implementing Agency for Crime and Security (IMPACS)
- The Regional Security System (The OECS and Barbados)
- Caribbean Disaster Management Agency (CEDMA)
- Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA)

---

While CARICOM must be commended for recognising the significance and cross-cutting nature of security, and for its collective efforts in the aftermath of hurricanes Irma and Maria, it has not gone far enough to create and sustain a comprehensive interlocking security framework to cohesively confront the multiplicity of security threats the region faces. The limitation is a result of CARICOM’s approach to regionalism as a community of independent sovereign states. As mentioned earlier, Rodrik (2007) notes, that the political trilemma of the World Economy is that democracy, national sovereignty and global economic integration are mutually incompatible: we can combine any two of the three, but never have all three simultaneously and in full. Despite the validity of Rodrik’s argument, CARICOM can ill-afford to sacrifice human security for national sovereignty. An inclusive, regional sovereignty is the sovereignty that really matters in the context of complex security threats. Sovereignty, for small developing states, must be strategically utilised as resistance to ensure collective security and well-being. This calls for a new approach to regionalism that centers security and development regionalism. Security here includes but transcends military security to include the multiple and overlapping dimensions of human security. This in turn can advance sustainable development. A new approach to regionalism requires for its success deep solidarity across communities of peoples; political commitment to develop an ethos of regional sovereignty and a strategic alignment among often competing dimensions of human security. This new regionalism must be buttressed by a favourable global environment and mutually reinforcing bi-regional and other partnerships.

CONCLUSION

The intensity and severity of natural disasters expose fault lines in traditional notions of sovereignty and security and create intellectual and policy space to reconceptualise regionalism for small island developing states. The overarching conclusion is that severe natural disasters, occasioned by climate change, provide impetus for new regionalism, strengthened bi-regionalism and global leadership to promote human security. Following are some specific conclusions:

1. There is need to debunk the myth of ‘high’ and low’ politics in International Relations and Security Studies. Security issues are multi-dimensional, multi-level and cross-cutting. If climate change is viewed as ‘low politics and not securitised, this can exacerbate multiple security threats in several interrelated spheres: political, economic (to include poverty, energy and food security) social and environmental;
2. Natural disasters are cross-border in nature; transcending issues of sovereignty and territoriality. Hurricanes Irma and Maria did not differentiate between the independent and non-independent Caribbean. Non-sovereign territories should not translate to non-sovereign peoples. Narrow conceptualisations of sovereignty have implications for human security, citizenship rights, human dignity and genuine freedom;
3. The issue of hurricanes Irma and Maria exposed the unfinished business of European colonialism in the Caribbean. ‘Whose Caribbean’, one may ask? As was the case during the colonial era, an age-old question arises in a new time: “what do we do with these islands”? As the EU confronts its own challenges (BREXIT, Catalonia etc.) there may be

a rethinking with respect to its relationship with its overseas territories, particularly if the 2017 hurricane season becomes the new normal;

4. Natural disasters expose the confluence of economic dependence, vulnerability, resilience and solidarity. The spirit of an informal Caribbean community shone through adversity.

5. For small island developing states, regionalism within an intergovernmental framework is inadequate to respond to multiple security threats. If the Caribbean is a Regional Security Complex as the evidence suggests, then the approach to regionalism must be aligned to the Caribbean’s security landscape. Failing to do so will further deepen human (in)security on several fronts;

6. Nature’s terror exposes distortions in global rules such as small island states and the question of graduation. This is an urgent issue that must be addressed for the survival of Caribbean states, the viability of Caribbean economies and the well-being of Caribbean people.

7. Developments within the EU may have far-reaching implications for its relationship with the rest of the world. As the EU evolves through a difficult transition, what does this mean for its relationship with itself and with the rest of the world? Can the EU be counted on to lead on critical issues, such as climate change? What are the implications for the EU’s Overseas Countries and Territories, for development cooperation and bi-regional relations? I am of the view that the European project has been tested through time and it is resilient enough to withstand its own internal storms.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the evidence provided, the following policy prescriptions are proposed:

1. There is an urgency for global action by all states in the international community with respect to the Paris Agreement. EU-CELAC Summit must continue to build on their commitment on the following issues, as agreed in their 2015 Summit:
   - Macro-economic stability & development financing, tackling the debt and fiscal fragility
   - Improvement of public safety and the need for new focus and policies to tackle crime related to illegal drugs
   - Environment and climate change challenges, through adaptation policies
   - Diversification of the energy matrix, with the promotion of renewal energies

2. Caribbean countries need to rethink the concept of sovereignty. The intensity and severity of natural disasters require a conceptualisation and utilisation of regional sovereignty. That is, the shared exercise of sovereignty to buttress the multiplicity of complexity that confront these small developing states;

3. There is need for continued dialogue on the question of independence for the non-independent territories. There could be scope within the EU-CELAC summity agenda to establish a Think Tank to address this issue;

4. Resilience-building must include the utilising of culture to tell the stories of nature’s terror
and its multiple impacts. Success stories must be chronicled to highlight the level of solidarity and bonds of kinship among Caribbean people in the independent and non-independent Caribbean. Music, art and dance etc. can be used to bring about healing, build resilience and celebrate successes.

5. CARICOM needs to transcend its choppy approach to regionalism and use security regionalism as a catalyst to deepen integration in the Caribbean. A bi-regional Task Force can be constituted to energise Caribbean regionalism. This Task Force can consist of representatives from EU-CELAC grouping, working in collaboration with the University of the West Indies, the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence at the University of Miami, among other institutions;

6. There is an opportunity for CARICOM and Latin American countries to partner with the EU and other global actors to advocate for a change in global rules from GDP per capita to allow vulnerable small island states to benefit from concessionary financing.

7. The sustainability of bi-regionalism between the EU and CELAC depends to a large extent on how literal and figurative storms are weathered; that is, within the EU as well as in LAC. Partnerships and global leadership are necessary imperatives for sustainability.
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