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Abstract

The regions of Southeast Asia and South America are often cited as puzzling cases of long peace among nation-states. Absent hard power balancing behaviours, liberal democratic development, and economic interdependence, both present unlikely cases for prolonged periods of time absent large scale inter-state violence. This research begins with an inquiry into the foundations the long peace of each region: practices of conflict management. More narrowly, this project asks: How can we understand cooperation and community building alongside persistent militarized violence? Upon what foundations have these largely illiberal states been able to build relative but lasting peace despite pervasive territorial disputes? In answering these questions, this research argues that distinct and diplomatic habits shape the management of peace and conflict in each region.

The underlying argument of this work is that the habitual and dispositional qualities of regional diplomatic practice inform the long peace of these regions and regional relations more generally. In each region, distinctive and discrete qualities of regional relations shape crisis response, but also shape how crises, themselves, are understood by regional diplomatic officials. These “habits of peace” make possible long-term regional cooperation and relative peace alongside persistent intra-regional violence.

After articulating the conflictual nature of peace in each regional case, I suggest that existing understandings of regional long-peace overlook the practical and tactical foundations upon which interstate cooperation rest. I offer a theoretical framework and
particular set of methods attentive to the habitual and dispositional qualities of inter-state relations. In the subsequent empirical cases I demonstrate the existence and effect of a particular regional habitual disposition in each region, with a particular focus on episodes of regional crisis including the 2011 Preah Vihear border dispute in Southeast Asia and the 1995 Cenepa conflict between Peru and Ecuador.
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Chapter 1.
Introduction and Structure

By many measures, the regions of Southeast Asia and South America exhibit exceptionally pacific inter-state relations, and have for quite some time. In South America, despite persistent territorial disputes and regime instability, war has been the exception rather than the rule since at least the 1940s. Similarly, in Southeast Asia since the 1960s war has largely eluded the region despite territorial disputes and inter-state rivalries that remain all but endemic. In both cases, scholars of many theoretical stripes have recognized a puzzling pattern of peace where we would not expect to see it: largely illiberal states experiencing long peace. In many accounts of inter-state relations, the absence of large-scale militarized violence is assumed an ephemeral and fragile condition of inter-state relations, and often the product of a tenuous balancing of material capability to disincentivize the costly escalation of conflict. However, in neither region does this appear the case. Similarly, democratic development and economic interdependence have long been assumed generative of sustained peaceful relations among states. Yet both regions demonstrate peace absent democratic regimes and with relatively limited interdependence. While these claims are developed in detail in Chapter 2, it is clear that both regions demonstrate puzzling patterns of peace. However, and the more puzzling, both regions demonstrate pervasive and violent inter-state conflict short of war. In both regions, there appears a long history of conflictual peace. This reality is often overlooked by scholars attentive to the long-peace of each region, yet it only serves to further underscore the puzzling patterns of regional peace in each case.

This research begins with an inquiry into the foundations the long peace of each region: practices of conflict management. More narrowly, this project asks: How can we understand cooperation and community building alongside persistent militarized violence? Upon what foundations have these largely illiberal states been able to build relative but lasting peace despite pervasive territorial disputes? In answering these
questions, this research argues that distinct and diplomatic habits shape the management of peace and conflict in each region.

It is the underlying claim of this project that the habitual and dispositional qualities of regional diplomatic practice inform the long peace of these regions and regional relations more generally. In each region, distinctive and discrete qualities of regional relations shape crisis response, but also shape how crises, themselves, are understood by regional diplomatic officials. These “habits of peace” make possible long-term regional cooperation and relative peace alongside persistent intra-regional violence. This claim stems from a rich literature that draws attention to the often less-than conscious social construction of the political world, and the unthinking foundations of much of human behaviour. As Chapter 3 explores, many scholars recognize that social action is shaped (Neumann 2002; Mitzen 2006a/b; Bjola and Kornprobst 2007; Adler 2008; Pouliot 2008; Adler and Pouliot 2011; Sending and Neumann 2011) if not determined (Hopf 2010) by knowledge and practices that are not consciously reflected upon by agents. As Hopf suggests, unreflexive and automatic cognitive and behavioural dynamics may be at work when “we see any durable relationships of enmity and amity between and among states” (2010: 547).

I contend that regional peace is one such pattern. In what follows, I argue that habits or habitual dispositions, rooted in distinct regional histories, particular cultures, and distinct understandings of regional and global norms, are the practical and tactile means by which diplomatic practitioners in each regional case recognize and respond to regional crises. These dispositional qualities of relations are robust, in that practitioners know they are efficacious and productive of peace and stability. They simply “work” in the minds of regional practitioners – and in ways often unfathomable to those external to the community of practice. These habitual qualities of regional relations and conflict management contribute to the durable and consistent patterns of conflict management apparent in each region, even if particular habits may also have unintended consequences that prolong conflicts and stymie their formal resolution. While these qualities of regional relations have a deflationary impact on violence each they also generate a
toleration of limited levels of violence in each region and may themselves have a protracting effect, making possible the long but conflictual peace of each case.

In the following Chapters, I develop a framework centred on the habitual and dispositional qualities of communities of diplomatic practitioners. I bring attention to the unreflexive cognitive and behavioural qualities of regional relations. These “habits of peace” circumscribe thinking and behaviour and make possible the particular and conflictual long peace of each of these puzzling regions. Before articulating this argument in more detail, two foundational concepts need explication.

1.1 Regions as Constructs

A region is an intuitive concept when thinking about world politics. Geographic proximity, naturally perhaps, leads to consequential interactions between states (see Miller, 2007: 41 and Bull, 1977: 10). Analytically, then a geographic region may be a useful level of analysis in making inquiries about inter-state relations given the presumably dense and important interactions between proximate states. Indeed, a focus on geographic regions has been a long-held one for International Relations (IR), and increasingly this focus is growing (see Tavares, 2008). Long established literatures have explored the emergence of cooperative inter-state relations by reference to multi-state regions sharing dense and iterated relations (e.g. Haas, 1964; Keohane, 1984; Buzan and Waever, 2003). In particular, many observers have recognized regions as the sites of community formation (Deutsch et al., 1957), or used this level of analysis to define and understand ‘zones’ of peace among multiple states (e.g. Singer and Wildavsky, 1993; Kacowicz, 1998; 2005). Barry Buzan’s (1991) concept of a “security complex”, for example, rests on the recognition that proximate states cannot reasonably think of their own security absent concerns over neighbouring states. Proximity matters. With a wider interest, the growing focus on “regionalism” – understood as a good aspired to and shared by multiple states (see Fawcett 2004) – has animated a huge literature focused on the processes of economic and political interdependence (e.g. Mitrany, 1965; Nye 1968; Fawcett and Hurrell, 1995; Mansfield and Milner, 1997; Acharya and Johnson, 2007;
Mansfield and Soligen, 2010). Across all these interests is a common and growing assertion that regions are an important – perhaps *the* most important (Fawcett, 2003; Katzenstein, 2005; Hurrel, 2007) – level of analysis for inquiries into important questions of inter-state relations. Indeed, as Benjamin Miller suggests, regions are “the most appropriate – and relevant – context for studying war and peace” (2007: 42; see also Miller, 2000).

However, just what constitutes the boundaries of a ‘region’ is fuzzy in theory and even more so in practice (see Lemke, 2002; Fawcett, 2004; Frazier and Stewart-Ingersoll, 2010). While geographic proximity is often a useful starting assumption in conceptualizing regional relations, it raises more questions than it solves. Southeast Asia, for example is considered by theorists and practitioners alike to exclude Papua New Guinea and Sri Lanka – much to their frustration at times – while the inclusion of Australia in the community of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) seems inconceivable (see Acharya, 1998: 216). Geography alone does not tell us much about what a region is – or why.

Rather, regions demonstrate some sense of intersubjective and ideational cohesion (Adler, 1997; Adler and Barnett, 1998). For practitioners within regional spaces regions are intuitive. They are socially meaningful categories that are confronted and also reified daily. In this way, they delineate thinking and shape relations themselves. Regions, then, are ideas rooted in geography, but not determined by it. These ideational constructs are multidimensional. They are comprised of assumptions of social and economic realities, of historical experience, and of interpretations of political expediency. Regions, then, may overlap. For example, many “South American” officials working in the Pan-American Organization of American States (OAS), recognize themselves as part of a multitude of overlapping ‘regional’ categories: part the Global South while also part of the Western Hemisphere or Pan-American region, existing within the South American region alongside the wider Latin American one, and also within a host of sub and cross-regional organizations including the Andean Community and the Pacific Alliance. As Fawcett (2004: 434) notes, “Ultimately, regions and regionalism are what states and non-state
actors make of them” (see also Harris, 2000: 498). Thus, as she continues, “To make sense of the idea of regionalism, a certain amount of both definitional and theoretical flexibility is required; there is no ‘ideal’ region, nor any single agenda to which all regions aspire.”

This research takes this suggestion seriously, and sets the bounds of ‘regional’ analysis congruently with how ‘regional’ practitioners understand their ‘regional’ identity(ies). As explored in Chapter 3, I understand regions as fields of interactions. They are imagined spaces, the boundaries of which can be discerned from the thinking and behaviour of practitioners.

1.2 Peace as Process

In each overlapping field – or community – individual diplomats and organizational officials of all stripes engage in a range of rather particular and meaningful behaviours. It is these discrete practices, and the taken-for-granted knowledge that stem from, that undergird cooperative and peaceful regional relations. Understanding peace in IR has generally rested on two underlying assumptions. First, investigations often start from an assumption of peace as a negative quality of the inter-state relations defined through the absence of large-scale organized violence – war. In this way, peace is often assumed a fragile and fleeting quality of inter-state relations under the “brooding shadow of violence” (Waltz, 1986: 98). John Gaddis (1991) famously observed the “long peace” between the super-powers of the Cold War, explained in part by nuclear deterrence and parity in material capability (see also Mearsheimer, 1990). The same thinking grounds liberal treatments of democratic peace, where institutions limit the potential for conflict by denying risky behaviour (e.g. Oneal and Russett, 1999; see also Fortna, 2003; Kivimaki, 2008). That Arthur Stein (1990: iv) could open his investigation of inter-state cooperation with the suggestion that, post-Cold War, “Peace, it seems, is breaking out all over the place” highlights this underlying assumption. Similarly Arie M. Kacowicz (1998) and his co-authors (2000) explore a basic level of pacific relations among states more generally by reference to the absence of war in regional relations (see also Boulding, 1978; Singer and Wildavsky, 1993; Martin, 2006).
Beyond assuming a simply dichotomy of peace and war, however, many scholars have posited gradations of peace (e.g. Galtung, 1969, 1975; Holsti, 1996; Kacowicz, 1998; Adler and Barnett, 1998; Buzan and Waever, 2003; Miller, 2007; Oelsner, 2007). In many of these accounts the main criterion for distinguishing between qualities of peace is ideational, reflecting the thinking of policy-makers and practitioners regarding the appropriateness of the use of force. This is most clear in the security community literature, where “dependable expectations of peaceful change” is the core measure of the emergence of mature and peaceful security communities (Adler and Barnett, 1998: 30).

This scholarship underscores the second underlying assumption: an assumed reflective and active appraisal by actors of their identity and their context. In many accounts of the development of cooperative and pacific inter-state relations, it is the “trust” among states – or state leaders, policy-makers and diplomatic officials – that makes possible stability in relations. Many and varied accounts of peaceful relations investigate the subjective foundations of trust, highlighting the development of common institutions and shared ideas – “trust-building properties” – that make it possible (Adler and Barnett, 1998: 42; see also Acharya, 2014; Singh 2011; Rathbun, 2011; Christensen, 2006; Katsumata, 2006). This is particularly clear in the vast literature on regimes, wherein iterated relations within institutionalized settings generate trust through active learning (e.g. Keohane, 1984). However, as Vincent Pouliot observes, the assumption that actors continually reflect on their context and their identity therein does not bear out when considering the very foundations of cooperative relations – diplomatic interactions (2008: 278). Relations between states are often, in practice, shaped not by conscious reflection but by commonsense and a given knowledge of efficacy in behaviour. Rather than continual, active appraisal of self, other, and the context in which they interrelate, in reality, policy-makers and officials representing states have variable but given senses of normal and obvious behaviour. Indeed most people most of the time think from what they know as common sense. In this way, peace may be better understood as a sustained process, and made possible by thinking and behaviours that provide the potential for non-violent means to resolve disputes (see Pouliot, 2010).
This research is less concerned with developing (yet another) a typology of peace, nor suggesting that either region under investigation is indeed a security community. Rather it seeks to extend the assumptions made in existing literature and to build on the observations of Pouliot and others (e.g. Mitzen, 2006a; Hopf, 2010) that patterns of peaceful interactions are informed by the unreflexive qualities of relations. In this sense, peace is understood to be an active, although not always reflected upon process, of inter-state relations. As Pouliot observes of security communities, “peace exists in and through practice when security officials’ practical sense makes diplomacy the self-evident way to solving inter-state disputes” (2008: 259). Similarly, Alice Ba observes that cooperation, more generally, is best understood as “a social processes involving interaction and cumulative social negotiations” (2009: 4). This research aims to explore the foundations of peace as process.

What is clear from the above survey is that regions themselves, and the paths to peaceful regional relations are likely to be varied. Socially, economically, and politically, regions represent hugely variable fields of relations, and peace is best understood as a process upheld by unreflexive diplomatic practices that are likely to vary across these communities. Taken together, while the process is often broadly similar, what upholds cooperative relations and maintains peace among different regions is likely to vary. What works in one setting may not in another.

1.3 Argument

The core interest of this research is to uncover the particularities of regional conflict management and thus the proximate causes of long and conflictual peace in each region. In this sense, the interest of this research is to show how peace works as a process in each case, and how the often banal given assumptions and normal practices of inter-state actors inform wider patterns of regional cooperation.
In what follows, I start from Pouliot’s suggestion that peace exists in and through self-evident diplomacy – when talk becomes the given way to solve disputes among states. However, I extend this line of inquiry and argument to investigate the particularities of practice, and the particularities of peace. I argue that particular, self-evident understandings of ‘normal’ diplomacy shape the experience of peace across diverse regions. I show that disparate communities of regional diplomatic practitioners embody, act out, and often reify discrete sets of habitual dispositions – deeply taken-for-granted knowledge of the world that, relatively automatically, shapes their behaviour. These ‘habits’ have their effect by shaping the very foundations of agency. As articulated in detail in Chapter 3, habitual dispositional like practices more generally (i.e. Adler and Pouliot 2011), shape behavior by delineating what actors know to be possible and effective behaviours when confronting the world. It is through habitual dispositions actors recognize problems and perceive potential solutions. These habitual qualities are social and intersubjective qualities of relations. As explored in more detail in Chapter 3, within distinct groups of actors – or communities of practice – individuals often share distinct dispositions towards certain ways of thinking and action. Of interest here, are distinct communities of diplomatic officials in each region – officials within and beyond regional state foreign ministries and the secretariats of regional inter-governmental organizations (IOs) representing states and their individual and collective interests.

Within such communities, as I document in Chapters 4 and 5, these practitioners know and practice distinctive means of conflict management. They think from, rather than about certain ways of confronting and managing regional problems, and furthering their individual and collective interests (Hopf, 2010: 541; Pouliot, 2008: 260). More concretely, and outlined in detail in Chapter 4, in Southeast Asia intra-regional relations are shaped by deeply held habits of informality, consensus-seeking, and non-interference that shape how regional crises are understood and managed. In South America, as documented in Chapter 5, intra-regional relations and conflict management more narrowly are shaped the habituation of rules-based and legalistic practices and a propensity towards external mediation of disputes. In each community of practitioners, officials understand crises through their particular habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations and, in each, state officials unreflexively turn to distinctive practices to
manage or resolve disputes. In this way, these particular habits themselves undergird patterns of conflict management and see similar regional crises responded to in distinct ways across diverse regional communities.

Indeed, distinct regional habits shape not only crisis response, but structure regional relations in particular ways. In Europe, particular habits may have been productive of a classical security community (Adler and Barnett, 1998). However, the regional habitual dispositions of Southeast Asian and South American diplomacy have produced something rather different. Southeast Asia’s is a long peace punctuated with violent conflict short of war occurring simultaneously with community-building and regional integration deeper than mere cooperation. In South America, a particular habitual disposition undergirds a long peace punctuated by major conflicts and lingering distrust that renders it far from a classical security community in many important ways. This argument complicates conventional constructivist and liberal-inspired wisdom that particular norms, particular communities, and particular states are necessary to produce peaceful relations. Rather, I show that a wide variety of norms, communities, and states may generate peaceful inter-state relations. The habituation of particular and efficacious qualities of interaction is key and, as I show, these practices may vary widely. Exploring the existence of these regional practices and how they work provides an understanding of how regional conflict is managed and thus relative peace maintained, but also offers insight into how certain regional practices may interact or clash with other practices of peace and security cooperation from other regions or globally.¹

Beyond the empirical conclusions, this research adds value to a number of existing studies and theoretical orientations. First, it offers a theoretical innovation in addressing the often-interrelated relationship between norms and practices. Contrary to much of the growing practice literature, this investigation does not brush aside the existence and importance of norms of appropriate behaviour. Rather, it sets to explore the relationship between codified and often abstract norms within and beyond the regions of interest, and examine their tactical and unproblematic expressions in practice. In competent practices

¹ I thank both Matthew Hoffmann and Steven Bernstein for this observation.
the particular and intersubjective meaning and unproblematic behaviour that stems from abstract norms are often apparent. Practitioners often engage in practices that both ‘work’ and exude a perceived sense of legitimacy (Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 22; Little, 2011: 186). Within different communities of practitioners, then, understandings and practice of regional and global norms may differ sharply. As the empirical chapters demonstrate, habituated practices embody, act out, and often reify particular and patterned interpretations of norms and afford them particular and patterned behavioural expressions that are distinct from their expression elsewhere. By confronting this interrelationship, this research extends the growing practice literature. It can be noted here, and is explored in greater detail in Chapter 3, that a focus on the self evident and automatic aspects of social relations – in this case inter-state diplomatic interactions – does not serve to deny agency, rationality, or intentionality. Rather it is an investigation into the foundations upon which agency, rationality, and intentionality rest. This runs counter to Hopf’s (2010) understanding of ‘habit’ and is unpacked in detail in Chapter 3. In this way, this investigation extends the growing focus in IR on the unreflexive and automatic aspects of social and political interaction.

Second, and relatedly, this investigation offers one means to observe practice and explore its consequence by contrasting the thinking and behaviour of one community of practitioners with another existing alongside it and by tracing the role of the habitual and practical qualities of community relations within a particular case of crisis response.

Third, this research offers a wide geographic focus, exploring inter-state relations in the Global South. Studies of long-term peace and the qualitative transition from conflict-prone to cooperative regional relations have largely focused on developed world, and Europe in particular (see also Lemke, 2002: 13-15). That focus tends to exalt the importance of democratic domestic politics and international economic interdependence (e.g. Russett and Starr, 1989; Owen, 1994, 1997; Oneal and Russett, 1999). This project, however, builds upon a growing literature that traces the foundations of pacific regional relations beyond the developed and largely democratic, Western world (e.g. Kacowicz, 1998, 2005; Ba, 2009; Acharya, 2014). As the empirical investigations show, the
conflictual peace apparent in each region is not dependent on a particular set of norms, such as those that within democratic regimes, or upon European styles of diplomatic interaction. Rather, long – if conflictual – peace may develop within varied regional communities of practitioners who habitualize specific and practical qualities of conflict management that offer appear, to those external to this community, as distinct or counterintuitive from global or regional norms.

The core interest of this work, then, is to explore the particular understanding and practice of conflictual management in each regional case, and thus to develop an account of the long and often conflictual periods of “peace” in the regions of South America and Southeast Asia by reference to the particular cognitive and behavioural habits of regional practitioners.

1.4 Plan of the Dissertation

There are five chapters that follow. Chapters 2 and 3 offer the theoretical grounding and empirical justification for this study. In Chapter 2, I articulate the puzzle of long-term regional cooperation and long peace in each of these cases. Following the suggestions of Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey Checkel (2014), I explore a wide breath of potential understandings, offering a preliminary exploration into their potential analytical utility both in terms of explaining the origins of peace in each region, and its maintenance – the latter being the core interest of this study. Ultimately, I suggest that the most promising avenues of inquiry focus on powerful actors in each region and the norms and cultural variables of regional relations, aspects of relations that are shaped by and, themselves shape, the cognitive and behavioural habits of regional relations. At the same time, I suggest that what is more puzzling is not merely the relative absence of war, but the level of pervasive and commonplace militarized inter-state violence that exists alongside community building in each region. This realization prompts a focus on the distinctive practices of conflict management in each regional case. In short, Chapter 2 provides an empirical illustration of what I term the “conflictual long-peace” of both cases and argues
both for the paucity of analytical fit of existent arguments to understand it and the need to explore regional conflict management as a way towards understanding.

In Chapter 3, I advance an analytic framework to understand the conflictual peace of each region, attentive to the cognitive and behavioural qualities of regional diplomatic practice. I pay particular attention to the often-overlooked relationship between codified and abstract norms and the practical and inarticulate qualities of regional relations. I build on social constructivist and practice theory in IR to articulate the concept of habitual dispositions, a useful means to recognize the habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations. From here I argue that a focus on habit matters – not just to correct an oversight in IR, but because such dynamics are likely the source of stability and continuity in inter-state relations, including for patterns of regional peace. I close this Chapter by detailing the research design and data I rely upon for the empirical investigations that follow.

In Chapters 4 and 5 I offer two case studies to explore the existence and consequence of distinct regional habits for both ‘long peace’ and particular episodes of regional crisis response. Each is structured over three parts, outlining the conflictual history of the region, uncovering the diplomatic habits that exist among regional practitioners, and exploring the consequence of these ‘habits of peace’ for regional relations.

Chapter 4 posits the existence and effect of a distinct and discrete habitual disposition of regional relations in Southeast Asia. I begin with a short contextualization of the long and conflictual peace. I then outline the multifaceted and discrete habitual disposition of regional relations. I focus on the informalities of regional relations and how the particular practice of regional and global norms indicates deeply internalized assumptions as to normal and efficacious diplomatic relations. After outlining the region’s habitual disposition, I examine its consequence through two investigations. First, I explore the robustness of these habitual qualities by reference to their assumed efficacy by regional practitioners – regional diplomats know that their brand of diplomacy works and thus see little cause to reflect beyond it. Second, I trace the effect of these practical and habitual
qualities of relations by reference to the regional response to the 2011 Thai-Cambodian Preah Vihear border dispute in 2011, a particularly violent inter-state conflict among regional states. I argue that the Southeast Asian habitual disposition makes possible the long conflictual peace the region experiences as its practitioners share a set of self evident practices that have both pacifying and protracting effects on their relations.

Chapter 5 mirrors the structure and argument of the previous chapter, to explore the existence and effect of distinct habits of peace in South America. I first explore the history of regional relations and the long history of the long conflictual peace of the region, before underscoring the discrete habitual qualities of regional relations. In particular, I highlight the formal and rules-oriented disposition of regional practitioners. I then explore the consequence of these qualities of relations in relation to both how practitioners understand their naturalness and in terms of the regional response to the 1995 Cenepa conflict between Peru and Ecuador. Again, I underscore the existence and effect of particular habits of regional relations that make possible the long and conflictual peace of the region.

In Chapter 6, I conclude. Here, I provide a brief comparison of the preceding two regional cases and introduce a third. After comparing the two empirical cases, I summarize the substantive, theoretical, and methodological contributions of this research and then demonstrate how the analytic framework developed here can travel elsewhere by exploring the existence of a habitual disposition among African Union diplomatic practitioners. I underscore the utility of this project by exploring the particular practical and dispositional qualities upon which political and security cooperation at the AU rests. Taken together, this final chapter brings the particularities of the habits of Southeast Asian and South American diplomatic relations into starker relief and better underscores their consequence. I conclude this Chapter and this work with a statement on the future of this research program.
Chapter 2.
Puzzles of Peace in Southeast Asia and South America

2.1 Introduction

I have two aims in this Chapter. The first is to demonstrate the puzzle that animates this research: the existence of long-term, but conflictual peace in these two regional cases. The second is to probe for a number of factors that may offer an understanding of community building alongside persistent militarized violence. This exploration, then, is the first step towards a framework to understand conflictual peace and one that centers on the importance of regional diplomatic habits, or *habitual dispositions*.

This chapter is divided over three sections. In the first, I introduce the puzzle of long-term regional peace in each case. Adding nuance to existing treatments of these cases, this section highlights the pervasive level of militarized conflict short of war in these cases. This makes the long peace all the more puzzling for each case, for conflict remains pervasive but rarely escalates to war. It is this recognition that founds the interest of this dissertation research and centres a potential explanation on the particular means of conflict management in each case. In the second section, I explore existing theoretical propositions that may provide insight into these cases. I survey eleven potential understandings for pacific regional relations and highlight those that appear to offer some analytical utility in understanding the foundations of the patterns of peace observed in each case. At the same time, I find that an important quality of inter-state relations is left out of existing accounts: the *habituation* of certain diplomatic practices and an appreciation of the taken-for-granted knowledge that make them possible. A focus on the habitual and dispositional character of regional diplomacy and conflict management, I suggest, may offer a fuller understanding of the particular and patterned relations within each case. In the third and final section, I bring this discussion together. I suggest these cases remain puzzling, and that a focus on regional habits may offer a more complete and
convincing understanding of the conflictual regional peace in each case. In short, this chapter advances the first step in understanding cooperation and regional community building alongside persistent militarized violence by suggesting a focus on the practices of conflict management in each.

Ultimately, the claims advanced in this chapter do not rest on an exhaustive test of alternative theoretical propositions. Nor do I offer a systemic alternative here. Rather, through “soaking and poking,” this chapter serves to illustrate the potential paucity of explanatory fit of some potential explanations for long-term peace and to highlight the potential utility of others (Bennett and Checkel, 2014: 18). Before examining existing understandings, I explore the puzzle of peace in each region.

### 2.2 Peace as a Puzzle

Territory and national self-determination have historically been central issues that drive conflict and war among states – they are the “stuff” over which states tend to engage in disputes that escalate to war (Holsti, 1991; see also Vasquez and Henehan, 2001; Huth, 2006a/b; Carter and Goemans, 2011; Johnson and Toft, 2013/14). In each of these regions, scholars have recognized pervasive territorial disputes that often lead to conflict, but rarely to war. Southeast Asia, particularly as defined by the five founding states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand – and South America, inclusive of the twelve states of the region geographically – Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Surinam, Uruguay, and Venezuela – have been recognized as puzzlingly peaceful. In South America, the emergent states of the mid-nineteenth century fought over the territorial delineation of their borders and lingering disputes and attempts at revisionism have defined the region and the geopolitical thinking of its leaders, particularly in reference to the authoritarian rule of the southern cone states of Argentina, Brazil and Chile from the 1960s to the 1980s (see Kelly, 1997; Kacowicz, 2000). According to Kelly, “territorial disputes embody the essence of South American geopolitics”, and yet war has all but eluded the region since the 1940s (1997: 11-12; see
Regional peace as a puzzle in each case is particularly stark when one takes into account only ‘war’ as defined as 1000+ battlefield deaths. This approach is implicit in many existing studies that posit a ‘long peace’ in these regions and beyond. Figure 1 provides the scant details of this assertion. It notes all ‘wars’ that have occurred between the states of each region, making use of the COW War (4.0) dataset (Sarkees and Wayman 2010).

Figure 1. Inter-state, intra-regional war in South America and Southeast Asia, 1850-2010

Figure 1 offers a limited and rather rudimentary description of regional relations – intra-regional, inter-state “wars” within each of these cases from 1850 to 2010 where regional states were in opposition. It notes the five wars in South America from 1850 to 2010 involving South American states on opposing sides, and the four war-level conflict that involve opposing Southeast Asian states, here defined by the ten current members of ASEAN – Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam.

South American war is concentrated in three decades prior to the 1880s as the emergent states of the Iberian colonies came into form. Many of these wars were disastrous. The 1851-1852 Platine War saw some 1,3000 battle deaths in a conflict primarily between the nascent Brazilian Empire and Argentina. The 1863 Ecuadorian-Colombian War represents a smaller scale event, with the United States of Columbia experiencing losses of some 300, and Ecuador 700. The War of the Triple Alliance or the Lopez War of 1865, however, represents a much larger-scale conflict decimating Paraguay, with some 200,000 battlefield deaths, Brazil suffering some 100,000, and Argentina 10,000. The War of the Pacific (1879-1883) represents a fourth war, here between Chile (3,276 loses)

---

2 For the Southeast Asian states, data begins only in 1946 reflecting their emergence as states. For both, the relevant COW data extends only to 2010.
and an allied Bolivia (920) and Peru (9,672). After these four wars within the span of thirty years, there are five decades of peace, as defined, from 1883. For many, this suggests either a long-peace itself for some fifty years, or an extended period from the 1880s to the present with two aberrations from a pacific norm. Within this longer period, there were two wars. The 1932 Chaco War was the last large-scale war, with 56,661 Bolivian battle deaths and an estimated 36,000 Paraguayan, and the “only major South American war of the twentieth century” (Martin, 2006: 86).

As Figure 1 notes, there have been no “wars” since, and the post-WWII period has been characterized by a puzzling absence of large-scale violence between these illiberal states. However, many scholars note the 1941 Zarumilla or Marañón conflict between Peru and Ecuador as a war in all but name (Martin, 2006: 88; Kacowicz, 2000: 86; Mares, 2001: 161-189). The conflict saw a flare in tensions and militarized violence along the long-disputed border lasting two weeks. It resulted in less than 1,000 casualties and, as a result, escapes coding as “war” in COW data (both 3.1 and 4.1) and analytical attention from many studying the long peace. However, as Holsti argues, it should be considered an “important war” due to the territorial changes it produced – Ecuador losing its access via the Amazon River to the Atlantic and some 200,000 square kilometers or 40 percent of its territory to Peru (1996: 154-155; see also Mares, 2001: 34). Moreover, it was not formally resolved until the signing of a Peace Agreement in 1998, after two violent flare-ups in the dispute in 1981 and 1995 – the focus of analysis in Chapter 5. Following the norm in the literature, however, coding at least 1000 battlefield deaths determines “war” in this discussion. This episode, and the recurrent violent territorial disputes after, illustrates the limits of examining militarized inter-state violence in the region when limiting the analysis to “war.”

Turning to Southeast Asia, from the 1950s onwards the four noted wars belie the fact that no ASEAN member states have engaged in a war among themselves after ascending to the organization, and a narrower focus of Southeast Asia as a region of five states – Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Singapore – is absent inter-regional ‘war’ entirely for this period. The three episodes noted as clustered around 1970 are conflicts within the umbrella of the Vietnam War, and the 1977 point represents the
Vietnamese-Cambodian War which saw the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia. Whether or not the record of ‘war’ provides immediate support for claims of remarkably pacific relations in these regions, a focus only at the level of ‘war’ is in may ways misleading. If the gaze is widened, it is clear that disputes and conflict short of war are rife in both regions during the periods scholars are wont to recognize as puzzling levels of peaceful relations.

Figure 2 narrows the temporal focus to the post-WWII period, 1946-2010, and widens the qualitative focus on conflict from “war” to all cases of Militarized Inter-State Disputes (MIDs) in each region (Palmer et al., 2015). This figure offers a glimpse at serious militarized disputes, and often military to military confrontations, and those episodes of violence that may have risked escalation to “war.” This description presents only conflicts within each region (excluding regional states engaged in conflict external to the region), and only those that saw regional states in opposition. It ignores conflicts that regional states were involved in that occurred outside of the region, and conflicts internal to the region involving external actors when regional states were not in opposition. It offers a more nuanced look at intra-regional inter-state conflict in each case, and with even a cursory review suggests a lot of regional conflict and violence – or noise – is lost when the focus is limited only to “war”.

Figure 2. Regional inter-state conflict in South America and Southeast Asia, 1946-2010
2.2.1 Southeast Asia

The empirical puzzle apparent in Southeast Asia depicted in Figure 2 is two-fold. Again, there is a puzzling absence of war and there have been no wars among ASEAN member states when these states have been formal members. This reality leads some to suggest the organizational form of ASEAN plays an important role in the establishment and maintenance of peace in the region (e.g. Ba 2009). However, this puzzle and the potential response are in some ways misleading. While relatively absent war, there remains a pervasive level of violent militarized inter-state disputes between regional states and ASEAN member states.

Some scholars have been keen to see a sharp and pacific shift in regional relations after the founding of ASEAN in 1967 (e.g. Ba, 2009: 48; Acharya, 2014: 46, Kivimaki, 2001: 19). Many who see a marked transition point to assumptions made of the 1960s. That the region was the ‘Balkans of the East’ has been a common refrain (Brecher, 1963; Chong, 2010: 127; Acharya, 2014: 4). However, the “major shift in the regional security environment” that some have recognized with ASEAN’s founding (Acharya, 2014: 4) is not easily perceptible when looking at trends in conflict short of war presented in Figure 2.

In the postwar period, from 1946 to 2010, Southeast Asian states engaged in 105 MIDs among themselves. Here the region is defined as the current ten member states of ASEAN: Cambodia, Brunei, Indonesia, Laos, the Philippines, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. These MIDS include 78 at hostility level 4 and three at level 5 (war). These war-level conflicts (hostility level 5) center on the Vietnamese War and Vietnamese-Cambodian hostilities after. They include the Vietnam War (MID No. 611), North Vietnamese incursion into Cambodia in 1970 (MID No. 1617), and the Cambodia-Vietnam War beginning in 1975 (MID No. 1435). These instances of conflict also include 23 at level 3 (the display of the use of force) and 1 at level 2 (the threat of the use of force).
In particular, the 78 level “4” MIDs indicate a pervasive and high level of conflict. These include acts of seizure, attacks, and military clashes – objectively conflictual actions between states that, while short of “war” as defined, denote the existence of pervasive and violent militarized inter-state conflict. Moreover, many of the conflicts that pepper the post-1967 period are the same that colored the earlier supposed “war-like” period of the early 1960s (Kivimaki, 2001: 19; Acharya, 2014: 46). These include territorial disputes between Malaysia and Singapore over Pedra Branca, Indonesia and Malaysia over the Sipadan and Ligitan Islands, Indonesia and the Philippines over the Miatan Islands, Malaysia and both Indonesia and the Philippines over Sabah, and Malaysia, Vietnam, and the Philippines over the Spratly Islands (see Kivimaki, 2000: 10-11; Wain, 2013: 54-55). A basic pattern is clear: from 1946 to at least 2010 war may be an aberration, but pervasive disputes remain.

The descriptive data in the above figures is telling of two realities. First, at the regional level there is little discernable difference between the pre-and post-founding of ASEAN in 1967. Rather, the levels of conflict remain relatively similar and the use of force short of war is widespread. There are 28 intra-regional MIDs (23 of which were level 4 or higher) in the ten years prior to ASEAN’s founding (1958-1967), and 20 (14 of which were level 4 or higher) in the ten years (1968-1977) after. Thus a “major shift” from low-level war to something more peaceful is not so easily apparent. Second, then, while these descriptive indicators suggest relatively parity in terms of the numbers and intensity of disputes during this entire period, they still demonstrate the relative dearth of war and of the escalation of militarized conflict in the region. These suggestions are all the more stark when the focus is narrowed to include only disputes between formal ASEAN member states.
Figure 3 adds this nuance, limiting the interest to just those MIDs that involve ASEAN member states at the time of their membership. From 1967, at the founding of ASEAN, to 2010 there are 26 MIDs that involve formal members of ASEAN in conflict with another formal member of ASEAN. Of these, 18 are level 4 (the use of force), and 8 at level 3 (the display of the use of force). The lesson from this, again basic, description is that the region is certainly not devoid conflict, even among formal ASEAN member states.

2.2.2 South America

Many scholars attest to a particularly lengthy long-peace of South America – from 1883 and onwards (Kacowicz, 1998), or from either 1935 (Martin, 2006) or 1941 (Mares, 2001). Debate remains as to an analytically useful starting point for a sustained period of relatively peace, but there is a general consensus that the region exhibits a long period of relative peace and one that is distinct from the region as it emerged from post-colonial violence. In short, many see the development of a relatively stable and peaceful region where we might not expect it. Yet, as with the Southeast Asian case, a lack of war does not suggest a lack of militarized confrontation and violence, and the recurrent perceived

---

3 This description thus only includes conflicts between regional states after they have ascended to the organization. It ignores conflicts between ASEAN member states and non-ASEAN member states until they have ascended. Five states founded ASEAN in 1967, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. In Brunei joined in 1984, Vietnam in 1995, Laos and Myanmar in 1997, and Cambodia in 1999.
threats and territorial conflict that, prior to 1883, had been cause of decades of war did not vanish (Kacowicz, 1998; Hurrell, 1998; Mares, 2001; Martin, 2006). Centeno observes that “the years 1860-1880 were particularly bellicose, with almost every country in the region invading a neighbour” (2002: 37). Yet, as explored earlier in this Chapter, militarized disputes did not disappear with the apparent long peace that emerged as war became an aberration. The 1902 “tug of war” between Argentina and Chile over their common Patagonia border, their 1978 dispute over the Beagle Channel Islands, the 1941 Cepena “War” between Chile Peru and, the enduring Argentine-Brazilian rivalry to name just a few, serve to illustrate this reality (see Kacowicz, 1998: 20; Kacowicz, 2000; Mares, 2001: 32-46). Further, the region has been defined by internal conflict, military coups, and civil conflict that may have risked escalating inter-state conflict as well. Scholars of long-peace, however, tend to ignore the pervasive level of inter-state militarized disputes and to view any large scale violence as a minor aberration from the pattern of peace (see Kacowicz, 1988; Desh, 1998). Mindful of the five ‘wars’ noted in Figure 1 above, Figure 4, again presents an image of the level of inter-state violence in the postwar period.

Figure 4. Hostility Level of Militarized International Disputes involving South American States, 1946-2010

4 On regional trends in this regard see Mares (2001) and Martin (2006).
5 Mares (2001) is an exception and is discussed below.
During the post-WWII period noted in Figure 4, South American states were engaged in 70 militarized inter-state disputes amongst themselves. These include 39 at hostility level 4 (the use of force), 30 at level 3 (the display of the use of force), and 1 at level 2 (the threat of the use of force). While war may indeed be the exception to the regional rule, the relative dearth of ‘war’ belies the plethora of near-war conflicts. As in the Southeast Asian case, once a focus shifts from ‘war’ there is much conflict below the surface.

As Holsti observes, the “record of near wars until the 1980s [and perhaps beyond] would place the region only at the ‘introductory’ levels of no-war zone” (1996: 158). Mares agrees, and suggests that in the broader context of Latin America, “the use of violence across national boundaries has been a consistent trait” (2001: 28). As with Southeast Asia, during this period war may be scarce, but conflict remains pervasive. Further, while there have been two glaring exceptions to the inter-state norm of peace during this period, endemic territorial disputes have been settled in formal means short of war. As Holsti, again, attests, “The number of territorial disputes and crises that have not escalated to war remains unique compared to other areas of the world” (1996: 164).

This brief exploration of regional militarized inter-state disputes suggests that the long-peace of both regions should not imply a lack of violent inter-state militarized conflict. Rather, disputes remain pervasive in each regional case. This reality serves only to compound the puzzle at the heart of this project as it suggests particular patterns of regional peace and conflict in each case. It is clear that in both regions, conflicts remain short of war and while pervasive, are often limited in intensity. This conclusion beckons an investigation of the regional management of peace and conflict in the cases, including a focus on the pervasive MIDS, or regional crises, that puncture the long absences of war in each case. Moreover, given this conflictual reality, these two regional cases appear particularly puzzling for IR scholarship interested in the traditional concerns of peace and

---

6 It can be noted that Mares suggests that the wider Latin American region exhibits patterns of war similar to the rest of the world, save for the Middle East (2001: 28-29). His focus, however, is not only on a wider region (including Central America states) but also on conflicts with actors externals to the region (e.g. the Malvinas or Falkland Islands war).
conflict and *prima facie*, the cases appear least likely cases for ‘long peace’ to exist. In what follows, I explore a number of paradigmatic approaches that may offer insight into these patterns.

### 2.3 Understanding Peace

There are a multitude of potential explanations or paths for understanding these cases of conflictual long peace in existing scholarship. Cognizant of this, various paradigmatic approaches to understanding and explaining peace, conflict, and conflict management in IR can be assessed as potential starting points for investigating these regional cases. Again, this chapter does not seek a rigorous test of disparate theoretical claims. Rather, it offers a probing and partial application to determine a sense of analytical fit. This section serves to illuminate those potential understandings most worthy of a more detailed exploration and also note those that appear dead ends. Kacowicz (1998) offers a perceptive and systematic means to this end. Borrowing his precedent and others (e.g. Martin, 2006), three sets of factors can be posited as starting points for this investigation. Following the paradigmatic theories of IR, these draw our attention to material considerations, institutions and interdependence, and the cultural and normative foundations of inter-state relations. This section explores these factors in turn before offering the foundations of my own suggestion, that diplomatic habits may inform patterns of regional relations.

### 2.4 Capability and Power

The assertion that power corresponds with peace is a mainstay of (neo)realist IR theory. John Mearsheimer, for example, suggests that “peace is mainly a function of the geometry of power in the international system, and certain configurations may be very peaceful while others are more prone to war” (1991/92: 220). Three factors are generally

---

7 See Kacowicz (2005: 70) for a similar suggestion.
highlighted in such materialist or realist accounts of peace: an asymmetry of power, a balance of power, and a dearth of power. From these three power-centered factors, six propositions emerge. Peace may result from (1) the asymmetric or hegemonic power of a regional state, or (2) from the asymmetric or hegemonic power of a non-regional, global power. Further, peace may result not from asymmetric power distributions, but rather the relative balance of material capabilities (3) within the region or (4) beyond, within the larger global balance of power. Finally, (5) a lack of capability may render the potential for war moot within a region, or (6) should there be nothing to go to war over, then the puzzle itself is lost. I explore these six propositions in turn.

2.4.1 Asymmetries of Power

An asymmetric distribution of power is assumed consequential for the emergence of war and peace, as a hegemonic power, within or beyond a region, plays a stabilizing and pacific role (Levy, 1998: 145-146; see also Aron, 1966; Buzan, 1991: 219-221). Asymmetric material power undergirds the status quo by dissuading potential challengers from attempts at reform and thus mitigates the potential of conflict escalating to war.

Such a dynamic is not easily apparent in the Southeast Asian case. Figure 5 demonstrates the relative dominance of Indonesia in this regard in reference to the other founding ASEAN members and the five additional regional states from 1960 to 2007. This figure makes use of the Correlates of War Composite Index of National Capability (CINC) score. This score aggregates six traditional measures of material capability (iron and steel production, military expenditure, military personnel, energy consumption, population, and urban population) for a state in a given year, and represents the state’s share of the international system’s material capability. As displayed here, the CINC scores are provided as relative to share of the regional total (the region defined by those states within the figure). Thus, the x-axis displays the relative weight of CINC score for the region. This offers a basic – if crude – measure of the regional shares of relative material capability, the foundation of (hegemonic) power.

---

9 For realist logic and treatments of long peace, particularly with regards to Europe, see Gaddis (1990) and Waltz (1979).
While there is some limited variation in the region over time, notably the steady rise of Thai vis-à-vis Filipino capability in the early 1990s, it is clear that Indonesia represents the top of the regional hierarchy in this regard, and by a large margin. From a height of some 61.5 per cent in 1960 to a low of 39.1 per cent in 2007, Indonesian capability is generally two to three times that of the next regional power. Thus, perhaps power is a factor worthy of analytic attention. This story takes place only within a narrow view of regional relations, however, and the large distinctions here are rendered trivial within a broader context. Figure 6 places this narrow regional outlook in a wider context. It adds the United States and China to this story, as the two core non-regional powers, while removing all regional states save for Indonesia for the sake of clarity. It presents their CINC scores in reference to the sum total (100%) of the regional CINC score – the region, again, defined by the ten current ASEAN member states. The realities of the disparities in national capability when these two extra-regional powers are compared to the CINC score of the region’s leading state are starkly apparent.
It is generally accepted that the asymmetry of regional power positions small, weak states against the neighbouring giant of China or the US (see Almonte, 1997/8; Jones and Smith, 2006) and this is clearly on show in Figure 6. That the region is populated by “lesser powers and lesser economies” wherein none is exceptionally powerful is a conclusion made possible after examining Figure 6 (see Ba, 2009: 25 and 253 fn30). While Indonesia is clearly asymmetric in the scope of the narrow region, it is clear a claim to hegemonic potential may be short sighted. It is dwarfed, of course, by the global players of the wider region. The US in 1960 is a full ten-fold the aggregate regional CINC score and, at its lowest is still more than four-times that of the region. China
represents a similarly herculean discrepancy of 3.5 to six times the CINC power of the region’s total at its relative lowest point the early 1990s. Examining simply capability differentials, the shadow of global power over the region is a long one indeed.

The role of the US, in particular, appears a potential a factor worth analytic attention, then. However, while Singapore, Thailand, and the Philippines have been assisted heavily by US security arrangements, the American relationship with allies in the Southeast Asian region does not parallel its security arrangements with Japan nor its direct involvement in Vietnam. It is not clear that the US has translated its capability into a commanding or hegemonic role in the region in the same way (He, 2008: 512 fn2). Indeed, rather than offering a direct and stabilizing role in the region, at first look as Ba (2009) observes, it is American instability that has driven the development of Southeast Asian regionalism and thus may inform the patterns of peace and conflict. For example, it was fears over possible US intervention that drove the emergence of ASEAN in 1967 and, fears of US disengagement the development of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in 1994 (Ba, 2009). The hegemonic influence of the US in this case, then, is far from clear. Similar conclusions may be drawn for the role of Chinese power. As Ba notes, external uncertainties regarding both Chinese and American interests in the region appear correlated with the development of ASEAN cooperation and regionalism, but “such events do not in and of themselves explain whether there is change or what kind of change ensues” (2009: 26). Indeed, as Kivimaki concludes “there is no correlation between the variation in power structures and US position and the number of conflicts or battle deaths in ASEAN” and thus little cause to suggestion US hegemony is a source of the long ASEAN peace (Kivimaki, 2012: 411; see also Kivimaki, 2008 and 2010). However, given these power differentials explored, attention may be directed to the potential for Indonesian leadership within the region, and perhaps the role of external great powers in making possible long peace.

Turning to the South American case, for many scholars Brazil represents the “quintessential status quo power,” and has played a stabilizing role in the region since its independence in 1822 (Kacowicz, 1998: 89-90; Holsti, 1996: 162-163; Burges, 2010).
Brazil has tended towards an avowedly “diplomatic way” of conflict resolution and has eschewed the use of military force in the region, particularly in the post-1945 period (Kacowicz, 1998: 91). With its large capability and its geographic centrality – bordering all South American states but Chile and Ecuador – its hegemonic potential may have been influential in both establishment of regional peace and its continuance by dampening potential challenges within the region (ibid). This relative capability is apparent in Figure 7, which again posits the relative share of the states’ CINC of the region vis-à-vis the regional total. For the sake of clarity, only the six largest regional states have been included, while the x-axis still represents the share of the regional total (of the 12 states).

Figure 7. Relative Share of Regional South American CINC, 1870-2007

In reference to material capability alone, Brazil is clearly the most powerful state of the region. As Holsti observes, “Brazil has more territory and greater population and economic strength than all the remaining countries of the continent combined” (1996, 157). This is apparent in Figure 7. From a height of 58.3 per cent of the regional total in 1873 to a low of 33.8 per cent in 1955, and roughly 50 per cent from the early 1980s onwards, it is clear that Brazil dwarfs the other states of the region in this regard. However the translation of this capability into hegemonic power is not so clear. Holsti contends, for example, that despite its gargantuan regional capability, Brazil has never
pursued a clear expansionist role in the region, but has rather been territorially “satisfied” throughout the twentieth century during the long peace (1996: 157). Thus, we have some cause to posit the potential role of this regional power in establishing and perhaps maintaining the South American the long peace.

As with the Southeast Asian case, the inclusion of core and regionally engaged global powers brings into stark relief the dearth of capability in the regional cases themselves. Figure 8 introduces the United Kingdom and the US to this story. Given the massive capability disparities, for the sake of clarity of the South American states only Brazil remains in the figure. While this image illustrates compelling hints of the UK-US hegemonic transition and the centrality of the World Wars, it offers little to our story beyond the obvious: the UK and US, indeed, represent extra-regional great powers relative to the states of the South American region. This relative power is particularly evident early in this timeline with the peak of British relative capability occurring in 1871 with more than 15 (1531.8) times the South American regional CINC, and in the years surrounding the World Wars. The US reaches its relative zenith in 1919 with nearly 17 times the South American region’s CINC score (1697.8) and the UK sees the height of its 20th century relative capability in 1915 with more than eight times that of the region (819.2). In the post-war period, the US sees another peak in 1940 with nearly eight times (780.2) the South American CINC score, and the UK again to more than three and a half the regional total (366.9) in 1915. While the UK sees a steady relative decline from 1946 (359.8) to a low in 2007 (42.5) – and is eclipsed in relative national capability by Brazil in 1983 – the US remains at least two and a half times the regional CINC throughout the post-war period (with a low of 266.5 in 1987, and post-war high of 1348.1 in 1945).

However, this level of aggregate national capability tells little us little about power and influence, and while these differentials in capability mirror those of the US and China in Southeast Asia, the level of hegemonic engagement does not.
The South American case offers even less evidence for the proposition of a global hegemonic influence on the course of regional conflict, in large part because the hegemony of great powers appears initially ephemeral and ultimately varied (Mares 2001; Dominguez et al., 2003). Prior to 1850, it has been asserted that under the yoke of the British informal empire, hegemonic influence may have quelled potentially escalatory territorial conflict, but less clear is any influence in the latter half of the 19th century when the regional long peace emerged (Cenento, 2002: 71). Turning to the US, prior to 1948 there seemed little American interest in actively quelling conflict in South America. Centeno uses the 1941 border dispute between Peru and Ecuador to illustrate a similar point. Not only did the US not involve itself in the conflict, preferring to be regarded as a “disinterested friend and consoler,” it dissuaded French and British involvement to limit the crisis (2002: 72). There may be cause to see a limited role in dissuading regional conflict as a result of the perceived threat of US intervention (Kacowicz, 2005: 53). However, the impact of this perception was less in terms of restraining conflict and in terms of acting as an impetus for the development of legal means to protect weak states from potential US interventions, as explored in Chapter 5. There may be a correlation.
with US power and South American peace, but it is not caused by it. The violence between Peru and Educator is illustrative of this reality and the limits of the claim that relative peace has been generated or maintained by US power within the region. As Mares (2001) observes, the assumption that the US has impacted conflict dynamics directly is often overstated and a pervasive “myth of hegemonic management” does not bear out in this dyad or more generally. Further, that the zenith of American hegemony, from 1945 to the 1960s corresponds with the pursuit of pan-Americanism via the OAS in 1948 also underscores this point. For many this suggests an important aspect in the development or deepening regional peace once established (e.g. Mace et al., 2007). That the height of British influence preceded the emergence of the ‘long peace’, and the height of American influence followed it, provides little to suggest an external hegemonic role in the establishment of peace and raises questions about its role in the development of peace. Thus, the influence of global hegemonic power appears even less relevant in the South American case than in that of Southeast Asia.

2.4.2 Balances of Power

The second set of material propositions draws attention not to the asymmetry of power, but to the balance of relative material capability. Should a balance of power among states emerge within the region, so this logic suggests, conflict is less likely to escalate for the risks of revisionism increase. Realist treatments of the European long peace have long held that the bipolar international distribution of power was productive of the pacific post-war period (see Duffield, 1994). Further, states of a region may themselves be united and balanced against a common intra- or extra-regional threat, which, again, may be productive of a lack war or escalation of lesser conflicts in a region. Such balancing dynamics may inform the establishment and maintenance of peace in these regional cases.

However, it is clear that in Southeast Asia there has been no internal balance of power within the region. Lacking, explicitly formal alliance dynamics, and as a region defined

---

10 Holsti concludes that “Whatever the external pressures [i.e. US, British or organizational pressures from the OAS or UN] during crises and conflicts, the South American governments have displayed a unique predisposition to search for peaceful solutions” (1996: 164).
by ascent to the common ASEAN as an organization, this dynamic offers no utility to explain either establishment or maintenance of peace. No formal intra-regional balancing is apparent.

When ASEAN was founded in 1967 its five small member states perceived two types of potential threats to their nascent independence. The first, and perhaps most apparent, was domestic rather than international. The need to consolidate their statehood vis-à-vis domestic challenges to authority is clear. As Indonesia illustrates, and Ba observes, the underlying assumption in 1967 was that “real security could only be gained by strengthening one’s economy and political situation at home – difficult to do when one is fighting with one’s neighbours” (2009: 56). The relationship between national consolidation and regionalization is not a one-way street. It was assumed that regionalism would buttress nascent statehood, and that consolidated states would undergird more stable inter-state relations. Adam Malik, Indonesian Foreign Minister in 1967, suggests this relationship is akin to a neighbourhood: “before neighborliness can be achieved satisfactorily the foundations of each house must be firm and solid… [O]nly then will it be able to enter into a neighborly intercourse with the rest” (quoted in Ba, 2009: 54-55; see also Acharya, 1998: 203). 

Yet to place each respective national home in order, these states faced a dual threat. China has dominated the region’s history as a powerful and – after the formation of the PRC in 1949 and the cultural revolution of the 1960s – a possibly expansionist neighbour. Having provided material and ideational support for insurgencies across the region, it was perceived as a threat to the region (Storey, 1999/2000; Ba, 2003; Ciorcairi, 2009). Domestic instability and weakness may not only have invited Chinese coercion and potential expansion, but as the decade long post-Dien Bien Phu escalation of American efforts in Vietnam made clear, it risked American involvement as well. Singaporean Foreign Minister S. Rajaratnam articulated this concern in 1967:

If there are people who misunderstand the proposed grouping, or manifest hostility towards it, let us explain that it can only be because as in Europe and in many parts of the world, outside powers have vested interests in the balkanisation of this region. We ourselves have learned the lessons and have decided that small nations are not going to be

---

11 As is explored in Chapter 4, this language and the underlying assumptions remain apparent among regional practitioners in 2014 as well.
balkanised so that they can be manipulated, set against one another, kept perpetually weak, divided, and ineffective by outside powers (quoted in Ba, 2009: 64).

Self-determination and national independence were interlinked with the impulse towards regionalization in Southeast Asia, and national consolidation and stability central aims of the regional project. As Ba notes, beramkang, or “survival in togetherness” is an undergirding logic of ASEAN (2009: 57). In this way, a particular kind of common balancing may be apparent – against both perceived foreign and domestic threats. The maintenance of peace and its deepening may also correlate with this impulse. The deepening integration of ASEAN itself and the broader institutionalization of the region may have also followed these dynamics.

The ASEAN Regional Forum is a case in point, as an institution designed to address fears of China’s growing power and ensure continued American support of Southeast Asian agency that serves to further institutionalize intra-regional cooperation. Established in 1994, the ARF is the largest security dialogue forum in broader the Asia-Pacific region, and a product of common regional concerns in the immediate post-Cold War period. Conventional explanations suggest the ARF was designed to forestall a potential US disengagement from the region as the Communist threat collapsed and at the same time tame potentially expansionist Chinese aspirations (see Evans, 2003; He, 2009). Leifer suggests the ARF’s fundamental purpose was to “create the conditions for a stable balance of power” in the region vis-à-vis these threats (1996, quoted in Katsumata, 2006: 184). There is some cause, then, suggest the dynamics of regionalism and thus potentially the patterned long peace itself, were informed by a kind of balancing against some threat external to the states of the region, be they neighbouring powers or domestic insurrection. Thus, there is some suggestion that the founding and maintenance of peace in Southeast Asia may be correlated to the recognition of common external threats and a type of non-traditional and less institutionalized balancing.

A similar dynamic may be apparent in the South American context, and over a much longer period of time. Paralleling the Southeast Asian case, there was a common interest in domestic consolidation at independence (Kacowicz, 1998: 100; Centeno, 2002: 24;
The states that emerged from the Spanish-American Empire were generally comprised of a small creole elite and a large non-Spanish-speaking majority, with little internal unity outside this elite (Centeno, 2002: 24-25). The creole elites’ attempt to establish and consolidate independent authority from along national lines was pursued with this demographic asymmetry in mind. As Benedict Anderson observes, the nascent independence movements of many South American states were driven by an elite-based interest in quelling rival claims to independent authority (2006: 48-49). Further, after independence, many emergent states sought to consolidate authority by extinguishing rival claims to authority, but also (and relatedly) through economic development. However, this impulse to domestic consolidation vis-à-vis regional stability, while similar to that of the Southeast Asian experience, develops during the conflictual period prior to the 1880s, as the emergent states of region fought for independence and territory.

If there is some commonality in a potential impulse toward pacific regional relations for reasons of domestic consolidation, there is a stark difference in terms of formal intra-regional balancing. Periodically, during the South American long peace, there emerged hard-balancing behaviours and alliance formation not experienced in Southeast Asia. Largely driven by the Brazilian-Argentine rivalry, two periods of balancing are apparent: from 1883 to 1919 and again during the 1970s. In the first period, Brazil allied with Colombia and Chile, and Argentina with Bolivia and Peru, and suggested a typical hard balancing dynamic. This, alone, provides evidence of a limited but “institutionalized balance of power” among regional powers at the onset of the long-peace (Kacowicz, 1998: 74). It can be noted that the ephemerality of these dynamics suggest a correlation with the establishment of regional peace, but less with its continuance (see also Mares, 2001: 109-131; Dominguez et al., 2003). If the interest is shifted to the balancing behaviour of the region’s states vis-à-vis an external threat, there appears, again, great dissimilarity in the experiences of both regions. No international threat was of consequence in the South American case after the 1880s and there was no formal balancing of South American states against an external threat.
While some may suggest the Cold War is illustrative of an American threat to the sovereignty of Latin American states, this was far more apparent in the Central rather than South American context, and direct balancing against the hemispheric hegemon is not apparent (Kacowicz, 1998: 95-96). The emergence of the Bolivarian diplomatic tradition suggest a further complication for this logic. The threat of European powers to nascent South American independence did indeed provide fuel for Bolivar’s call for unity in the 1820s, but with the failure of the 1826 Congress of Panama such a common balancing and unity was, at least temporarily, lost as four decades of instability followed (see Tussie, 2009: 171). This dynamic, then, does not seem to offer compelling insight into the existence or continuance of this long peace.

2.4.3 Absences of Power

Two final materialist propositions may be considered. Simply put, if there is little to fight over or little to fight with, peace is less of a puzzle. If state capacity is lacking, military conflict may not be possible and a basic peace may emerge from an inability to alter the situation. For example, Small and Singer (1982), among others, have noted a strong correlation between the bellicose behaviour, and thus risks of conflict, and economic and political power. Wendt offers insight into this view by suggesting that smaller powers with less potential to rely upon material means of survival learn the norms of state sovereignty more quickly than great powers which have freer hands to engage in conflict (1992: 415). If states simply cannot engage in large-scale violence, then their lack of large-scale violence is not puzzling. In neither case is a meaningful lack of military capability apparent however.

Turning to the Southeast Asian case, while the relative dearth of material capability is apparent in Figure 9, as reviewed, the ‘war-like’ period of the early 1960s and its continuance short of war after, suggests that a regional conflict was still a possibility among these states, even when their relative material capability was low. The sheer number of MIDs illustrate this point. That the relative material capability of these states increases during the long peace is indicative of this potential as well. Further, states in both regions demonstrate viable military capability within their own borders. Both the
states of Southeast Asia and South America have ably applied force domestically against attempts at insurrection and that conflictual periods preceded pacific periods suggests their capacity to engage in inter-state conflict as well. Within the South American case, the period preceding the emergence of peace is endemic inter-state conflict and war that illustrates the mobility and capacity of militaries in the region. The 1817 crossing of the Andes by Argentine and Chilean forces to secure Chilean independence from Spain, and large-scale movement of forces during the War of the Triple Alliance (1864-70) serves as early illustrations (Centeno, 2002: 49-51). Not only could and did the militaries of the region engage in inter-state war during this period, but Paraguay illustrates the possibility that state economies could be, and in this case were, monopolized by the state for waging war (Centeno, 2002: 55).

Moreover, as Holsti observes, it was the very weakness of regional states that lead to the war-prone 19th century in South America (1996: 152-153), and others echoed this claim by observing limited state authority facilitating the armed forces in some states to dictate foreign policy, often risking conflicts as a result (e.g. Varas, 1983: 74). State weakness ensured porous frontiers which were often claimed by others and such contested territories became the flashpoints for conflict that escalated to war:

> Even by 1848, almost all of the 1810 [territorial] limits had been challenged or altered by armed force, and the Spanish-speaking countries, relying on the principle of the historic foundations (e.g. documents of title, treaties) of territorial extent, disagreed fundamentally with Brazil, which held that territorial limits are based on effective occupation. Until 1945 military conquest was still a valid basis for a territorial claim (Holsti, 1996: 153).

Further, it is clear that both Argentina and Brazil have acted as traditional great powers in the region and had the relative capability to do so in the latter half of the 20th century (see Kacowicz, 1998: 109), even pursuing nuclear weapons to augment their existing material power (see Sagan, 1996/7: 61; Martin, 2006: 62-64). It is not out of lack of possible military capacity, then, that conflict has not escalated in these cases.

Secondly, a “peace by irrelevance” also seems unconvincing in both cases (McIntyre, 1993 quoted in Kacowicz, 1998: 96). This is clearly not the case in Southeast Asia. As
the contested territorial claims outlined at the onset of this section illustrate the potential for conflict and its escalation have been clear. Further, these states had dynamic regional relations and the formation of ASEAN itself was in recognition of the importance of regional economic and political relations. The South American case may suggest more pause for thought, particularly given the longer historical context. Some have suggested that the relatively unpopulated border regions of many states helps explain their relative peace after their independent boundaries were established (Kacowicz, 1998, 97; Kacowicz, 2000). William H. Bolin, for example, suggests that “the emptiness of South America’s border regions worked to insulate the nations of the continent from both trade and conflict” (1992, 170). In this regard, it may be that geopolitics determined the pacific realities of regional relations. Similarly, many have observed that until perhaps the 1960s, the region was characterized by vertical linkages to major external powers over horizontal intra-regional ties and thus a lack of conflict may stem from a lack of consequential interaction (Cenento, 2002: 26; see also Holsti, 1996: 163, and Kacowicz, 1998: 97). Two complications arise from these suggestions. With regards to the first, it is clear that populated or not, states in the region experienced conflict over rival territorial claims – that the seven decades prior to the 1880s were rife with territorial conflict and war exposes this reality. So too does the myriad territorial settlements short of war during this period and beyond. From 1851 to 1922 at least fourteen peaceful cessions and exchanges of territory took place in the region (Kacowicz, 1998: 105; see also Holsti, 1996: 163-164). Further, as the War of the Triple Alliance (1864-1870) makes clear, economic irrelevance alone does not obviate the potential for conflict and war in the face of divergent territorial claims. Finally, the logic of the second proposition is undercut by the fact that as interactions increased in the 1970s and 1980s, the basic peace held, and even deepened as organizational mechanisms and nascent liberal regimes were developed. Thus, there appears little to suggest that in either case peace stemmed from irrelevance.

12 The Thai-Cambodian border clashes near the Preah Vihear temple complex of 2011 are discussed at length in Chapter 4 and serve to keenly illustrate this point.
To conclude this assessment, an exploration of the long peace should indeed be attentive to certain power dynamics. While traditional balancing dynamics do not appear particularly consequential, the asymmetric distribution of capability and common concerns vis-à-vis intra- and extra-regional threats may offer some insights into patterns of long term peace in each region.

2.5 Institutions and Interdependence

Liberal peace literature (e.g. Doyle, 1983, 1997, 2005; Russett and Starr, 1989; Owen, 1994, 1997; Oneal and Russett, 1999) offers another series of explanations for peace. These that draw attention to three factors: (1) the democratic quality of states, (2) their economic interdependence, and, relatedly, (3) the instrumental effects of inter-state organizations. In particular, the widely held correlations of the democratic peace lead some to suggest normative and institutional mechanisms ensure democratic states resolve conflict or negate its emergence in relations with like states (Dixon, 1994; Russett, 1996; Bueno De Mesquita et al., 1999). Similarly, the security community literature, traditionally, points to the role of democratic institutions and economic interdependence as core factors in the establishment and continuance of peace (see Acharya, 1998: 198-199). However, in both our regional cases there is little to suggest these kinds of liberal dynamics play a powerful role.

It was not until the 1970s that South America saw democratization, a spurious development in connection with the establishment of its long peace in the 1880s. While the establishment of democracies across the region may have affected the quality of the peace (Kacowicz, 1998: 98-99; Oelsner, 2007; Battaglino, 2012: 141-142), these changes did not play a role in the establishment of peace and may not have informed its continuance in a substantial way (see also Mares, 2001: 84-108; Morris and Millan, 1983). As Holsti observes of the region, “military rule does not necessarily lead to war. And civilian rule, particularly during the nineteenth century (and in 1995) did not lead to peace… Domestic politics are no doubt important in explaining individual events, but variations between types of regimes do not correlate either the overall incidence of crises
and wars, or with the a propensity to resolve conflicts peacefully” (1996: 169). As one example of this complicated relationship, the rapprochement between regional rivals Brazil and Argentina began in 1979 when both states were under military rule (Kacowicz, 1998: 98-99; see also Gardini, 2010). Similarly, Mares suggests that the transition to democracy may have actually increased the likelihood of escalation in the enduring territorial dispute between Peru and Ecuador over access to the Amazon River, something explored in Chapter 5 (2001: 161-189; see also Varas, 1983: 76). Democracy, then, does not seem easily correlated with the establishment or continuation of the larger regional peace (see also Dominguez et al., 2003). There is even less cause for pause with the Southeast Asian case. At the onset of this regional peace, none of the five ASEAN members were democratic. Further, as Kivimaki observes, “the overall level of institutionalized authoritarianism was higher in ASEAN [states] during the peaceful period that during the warlike period [of 1960-1967]” with Thailand the lone exception (2001: 19). The democratic quality of domestic politics, then, seems unlikely as a fruitful avenue of inquiry.

Turning from political to economic dynamics, the results also appear less than compelling. The liberal logic of the pacifying effect of economic interdependence rests on the assumption that states seek to protect a beneficial interdependence on other states, to which escalatory conflict is threat (Oneal and Russett, 1999). To some degree, Southeast Asia demonstrates, and Figure 9 depicts, an economically interdependent region, with now some 25% of member state trade directed within the region. This is a modest level of interdependence by this measure. Intraregional trade is some 58 percent in NAFTA and 54 percent in the EU, for example (Owen 2012, 123). Further, this development is largely spurious to the development and deepening of the ASEAN peace. As Kivimaki, observes, using this measure ASEAN states were more interdependent in 1967 than they were in the two decades that followed (2008: 444; see also Kivimaki, 2001: 11-14; Kivimaki, 2012: 409-411). While the need to pursue economic development was a driving notion in the regionalist project to some degree (see Acharya, 1998: 204-205), given the limited economic interdependence of the region, this itself seems spurious as a cause of peace that emerged and deepened even as economic interdependence
remained static. Further, it is not clear that interdependence was valued by state actors and thus likely to have served to limit risky or aggressive behaviour that may undermine it. Indonesia, for example, pursued aggressive policies and attacked those states it was most interdependent with – Malaysia, Singapore, and the United Kingdom – during its bellicose Confrontasi period (Kivimaki, 2008: 444). Furthermore, this interdependence has remained relatively stable while the regional project has deepened substantially. Pacific regional relations and ASEAN regionalism in general seem less driven by economic independence than economic interdependence is a result of ASEAN regionalism.

**Figure 9. Intra-Regional Exports (%), founding ASEAN members, 1967-2012**
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Similarly, the South American experience offers little suggestion of the role of economic interdependence. Prior to the 1960s, the economic interconnections of the region were “almost null” and a kind of “Rousseauian autarky” appeared the norm (Kacowicz, 1998: 101; 97). Examining the post-WWII period, when data is reliable and available, there is little to suggest a useful analytic focus in understanding peace. As noted in Figure 10, from a foundation of roughly 10% in 1948, the share of regional exports does not match the near 20% of Southeast Asia at the onset of regional peace until the 1990s. There is little to suggest interdependence a driver in pacific relations in the South American case, and economic interdependence, again, may be more the consequence than the cause of pacific regional relations and potential integration (see also Kacowicz, 1998: 102).
A final and related proposition calls attention to the common organizational membership of states, and traditional institutionalist arguments point to the formalities of organizations in affecting cooperation. Joint organizational membership is assumed to restrain the agency of state leaders to engage in behaviour that may escalate conflict and offer means of mitigation should conflict arise, particularly if there is a plurality of decision-making within the organizations (Collins, 2007). Of particular importance are regional organizations established for explicit means of entrenching peaceful conflict resolution and interdependence (e.g. Oneal and Russett, 1999: 15).

Southeast Asia is a region now defined largely by ascension to ASEAN itself. Given the assumed start of the long peace in the mid-1960s and the establishment of the organization in 1967, there is cause to posit a correlation. The basic organizational argument rests on the logic that through a host of means, particularly decreasing the risks and costs of negotiation through formal mechanisms, organizations mitigate the escalation of conflict (Oneal and Russett, 1999: 9). However, as a relatively weak and informal organization, ASEAN seems to many institutionalists a mere “talk shop” reflecting little of the formal apparatus necessary to impact regional stability (see Katasuma, 2006). ASEAN is less reliant on institutional products – formal agreements and treaties – and legalistic procedures, and more on the informal processes and the spread of ideas (see Stubbs 2008; see also Ba 2009, 19-20; Katsumata 2006, 188). As one

*Figure 10. Intra-Regional Exports (%), states of South America, 1948-2012*

*Calculated using IMF Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS) Data (IMF 2017)*
observer suggests, “Asian regionalism… violates European-derived notions of institutions’ roles, focused as it is on sovereignty-reinforcement and prestige-taking rather than integration and binding rules” (Kelly, 2012: 409; see also Hofmann and Merand, 2012: 152, 155). Further, its closed and elitist nature abhors public participation and a plurality of voices, often assumed necessary to bind state interests and restrict conflict (Collins, 2007). As Ba summarizes, “institutionalists find in ASEAN few of the consequentialist rules and arrangements that, to them, are key to facilitating cooperation between competitive and divergent states” (2009: 2). Further, in the Southeast Asian case, diplomacy is often purposefully elitist and hidden from public view (Kivimaki, 2001). ASEAN, as an organization, then, seems to offer little to support the consequence of traditional institutionalist claims prima facie. However, as a site or ‘social environment’ (Johnson, 2001) that allows for routine interaction among practitioners it may offer important insights, as explored below.

South America too, seems to suggest a correlation between its long peace and its history of organizational development (see Holsti, 1996: 171). The Bolivarian tradition of the region, for example, is founded on an aspiration of integration through common organization, but with the explicit aim of consolidating nascent independent states (Mace and Therien, 1996: 5). This long-held aspiration has only in part, and only recently, been realized. The hemispheric project’s development through the OAS in 1948 may suggest a divergent form of regional organization, and the development of the Andean Pact of 1969 and Mercosur in 1991 exemplify the economic and political integration of the region. Further, the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) which came into force in 2011 may, in the future, prove consequential for impacting South American relations as well. However, the emergence of important organizations seems less correlated with the emergence of peace and more with the continuance and perhaps deepening of pacific relations (see Kacowicz, 1998: 195). As Holsti summarizes in attempting to explain the long peace of the region, “liberal-institutional theories do not take us very far because until recently there have been only low levels of integration and successful multilateral institution-building in the region” (1996: 161).
Thus in both these cases there appears little to suggest traditional organizational accounts offer insight into the establishment or the development of regional peace as means of incentivizing cooperation in a functionalist sense.

2.6 Peace by Satisfaction

Kacowicz (1998) offers a further proposition and one that begins to move more closer towards the level analysis and proximate causality of interest in this study. He marries the logic of democratic peace with that of realist power transition theory to suggest the possibility of “peace by satisfaction.” By this he means the acceptance of the territorial, military, economic, and diplomatic status quo by most, if not all, of the states of a region. His argument centres on the importance of domestic regime type and strength, and the position of a state within a regional or international hierarchy of power and prestige. Echoing insights from Carr (1981), Gilpin (1981) and democratic peace literature, democratic states – powerful or not – tend to support the status quo, regardless of their level of consolidation and regime-type. High status states, regardless of regime-type and relative power, also tend to support the status quo. Revisionism and dissatisfaction, then, most often stems from consolidated non-democratic states, regardless of their relative power.

As Kacowicz argues, revisionist states are lacking in both the Southeast Asian and South American contexts, he asserts (1998: 47-48; 105-116; 197). The central causes of satisfaction within these regions stem from the relatively weak states, which in the South American case “have been strong enough not to fall apart… but at the same time they have been weak enough that they find it hard to mobilize their societies for external war and conquest” (1998: 197). Centeno observes a similar dynamic and suggests that “state power [in South America] has always been shallow and contested” (2002: 15), a remarkable difference from the path of European state formation, and “a magnificent display of institutional failure” (ibid.: 17; 26). According to this line of reasoning, in South America, interests in territorial revisionism rest with a few less powerful states stymied by a lack of capability – limited war stems from incapable states. For these
observers, Southeast Asia, too, suggests a general satisfaction with the territorial status quo. Here, rather than stemming from a relative lack of capability, Southeast Asian satisfaction stems from the acceptance of a fitting regional hierarchy of prestige. Here, states with the capability and potential to engage in conflict that may escalate to war find little interest in it (Kacowicz, 1998:197-198). This logic approaches circularity, and a number of factors raise complications for these assertions, however. First, as systems theory has explored, an active and agentic interest in war is not a necessary condition for war. Simply stated, war may occur absent intention to that end (see Levy, 1990/91). Second, the assertion that “satisfaction” itself offers an explanation may be misleading. An understanding of “satisfaction” requires deeper engagement with the norms and practices of regional relations than Kacowicz affords it. Exploration of this context may suggest the importance of the normative and cultural aspects of regional relations in ways Kacowicz does not explore. The most consequential aspects of this argument may be the context or field in which diplomatic relations operates and wherein ‘satisfaction’ is made possible. In a general sense, Alexander Wendt provides a useful illustration of this underlying logic in regards to the assumed global norm of sovereignty:

What keeps the United States from conquering the Bahamas, or Nigeria from seizing Togo, or Australia from occupying Vanuatu? Clearly, power is not the issue, and in these cases even the cost of sanctions would probably be negligible. One might argue that great powers simply have no “interest” in these conquests, and this might be so, but this lack of interest can only be understood of their recognition of weak states’ sovereignty. I have no interest in exploiting my friends not because of the relative costs and benefits of such action but because they are my friends. The absence of recognition, in turn, helps explain Western states’ practice of territorial conquest, enslavement, and genocide against Native American and African peoples (1992: 415).

What this logic suggests is the consequence of appropriate and normal behaviour. Within particular communities or even globally, certain interests and behaviours are circumscribed by reflection on what is the “right thing to do” (Checkel, 2005: 804). Satisfaction may itself be the product of the cultural and normative foundations of regional relations that dictate appropriate, and even possible, conduct. Thus, while the satisfaction of states may be a factor of interest, analytical attention may be more usefully honed in on the cultural and normative foundations of relations. It is to this final set of factors that I now turn.
2.7 Cultural and Normative Foundations

In offering a wide array of potential avenues towards understanding patterns of peace and conflict, social constructivism draws attention to the intersubjective quality of social relations, and the shared knowledge and meanings that inform them and focuses across the levels of analysis from states as actors (e.g. Mitzen 2006) to the individual level of analysis (e.g. Pouliot 2008). It is clear that regional states and individual practitioners of Southeast Asia and South America exhibit common cultural and historical experiences, something some scholars suggest may formative of collective identity and the ultimate cause of pacific regional relations (Alder and Barnett 1998). In South America, for example, it was common experience – the ‘pilgrimages’ – of the creole elite of the Americas that provided the cognitive framework in which the nation itself could be realized (Anderson, 2006: 53-59). The common experiences of creole elites served to both differentiate themselves from the *peninsulars* of their Iberian imperial metropoles and unite them as a common other. In this example, common experience not only provides the foundations from which the concept of the nation could be conceived, but provides the substance by which relations among these nascent nations should be conducted – the particular substance of the webs of meaning and significance in which social actions takes place (i.e. Geertz, 1973). Indeed, social constructivists have highlighted particular sets of diplomatic norms and underscored their institutionalization over time in both regional cases.

Southeast Asia is often assumed to display a particular ‘ASEAN way’ of multilateral cooperation productive of regional stability (e.g. Acharya, 1998 and 2014; Harris, 2000; Katsumata 2006; Ba 2006; He 2008). Here, two central themes dominate the norms of regional relations: a preference for peaceful, negotiated dispute settlement (informal, personalized, and private rather than legalistic and public) and the sanctity of state sovereignty and its right to non-interference (e.g. Almonte, 1997/8; Kivimaki, 2001: 16-17). Thus the “diplomatic culture” (Ba, 2009: 27) of the region is a particular *ASEAN* one and deviates from regional norms elsewhere (see Soesastro, 1995; Kivimaki, 2001). The distinctive ASEAN way has for many been the foundation for regional peace (e.g.
Katsumata 2006; Ba 2009). Acharya’s focus on the norms of ASEAN diplomatic relations, for example, relies on assumptions of trust through norms of conduct that provide foundations for pacific regional relations (2014, 20). Inherently in his account, it is the reflection of actors vis-à-vis their identity and context that drives community relations. In many of these accounts, it is within the relatively informal organizational and institutional setting of ASEAN, that the organization itself appears to have the most important effect. Thus, the setting of inter-state relations appears worthy of inquiry, but with a particular focus on the cultural and normative dynamics at work therein.

Similarly, for many South America displays a set of common norms united by a particular and legalistic “diplomatic culture” (Holsti, 1996: 170; Kacowicz, 2005: 47; see also Heine, 2006 and Tussie, 2009). In this region its diplomatic ‘way’ or ‘culture’ rests on legalistic norms of obligation and recourse to the formal arbitration of disputes – and is thus distinct from that of Southeast Asia (Holsti, 1996: 169-171; Kacowicz, 1998: 102; 196). While it is clear that the cultural heritage of the region has variation – Brazil’s distinctive Portuguese linguistic and colonial experience is a stark example (see Hurrell, 1998: 231) – many assert that a common set of principles guide South American regional relations, stemming from common historical experience. Scholars have attested to the uniqueness of both the regulative norms of this diplomatic culture and its effects. Substantively, four normative principles unite South America in this regard (Kacowicz 1998: 103; Kacowicz 2005: 59-62; Anderson, 2006: 53): Uti possidetis (recognition of former colonial borders); peaceful international coexistence; nonintervention and mutual respect of national sovereignties; and peaceful settlement of international disputes, including the recourse to arbitration, mediation, and other similarly formal juridical techniques. Central among the latter has been a utilization of multilateralism. As Kacowicz perceptively notes, the “common historical, cultural and institutional heritage” of South American states has made possible the ideals of the region even when attempts at its institutionalization have failed, as with the South American political union of Bolivar’s dream and the less expansive unions of Gran Colombia (Colombia-Venezuela-Ecuador) and Peru-Bolivia (1998: 103). The effect of this common normative culture is observed by Holsti: “South American governments have frequently – and uniquely –
chosen legal means for defusing actual or potential crises. There has also been a history of policy-makers analyzing issues from a legal rather than geostrategic perspective” (1996: 170; emphasis added). Such thinking, informed by common culture and norms, can be productive of stable peace as war becomes unthinkable within certain communities (Kacowicz et al., 2000: 17).

There appears, then, to be utility in a focus on the cultural and normative aspects of regional relations, and cause to delineate and investigate the assumed bounds of appropriate regional relations. However, as explored in more detail in the following chapter, assumptions of either an ASEAN or South American diplomatic “culture” or “way”, rest on particular theoretical foundations that may obscure much of social reality. Underlying most of these accounts exist an implicit or inherent focus on actor’s choices and conscious efforts – how they actively represent themselves and their context, qualities of relations often recovered via discourse (see Holsti, 1996: 170). It is assumed ASEAN members know how to act appropriately and South American practitioners choose particular institutional mechanisms in times of crises and beyond. This “representational bias” (Pouliot, 2008; 2010) may not necessarily be problematic for particular understandings of peace, but they are perhaps limiting and incomplete. A deeper and distinct engagement with the practices and taken-for-granted foundations of regional diplomats may be in order to more fully offer an understanding of these regional relations. Thus, as the introduction suggests, there remains another and related proposition that may offer insight into the patterns explored above.

2.8 Habits of Peace

Stability in social relations is affected through the establishment of proclivities to engage in previously adopted practices as natural and to accept previously knowledge as unproblematic. Stability, as defended in Chapter 3, is often a matter of habit (see Camic, 1986; Hopf, 2010). This suggestion moves beyond and deeper than an appreciation of norms of appropriateness and into the realm of ontologically prior. As habits exist prior to and outside of reflection, habit not only influences what is perceived and what action is preformed, but also what is not perceived and not done (Hopf, 2010: 542). Collectively
held, habits and dispositions serve to make possible certain understandings of the world, defining what is assumed normal and bound and limit action, defining what is possible. Indeed, any consistency or durable pattern in social relations or pattern in social relations may suggest that habit is at work (see Crossley 2013: 150; Hopf, 2010: 547).

From such an account, inter-state peace itself, far from a negative definition as the absence of war, can be understood as an active and recursive process made possible not merely by active reflections on what is appropriate, but largely by unreflexive knowledge and habituated practices outside the level of reflection (see Adler, 2008: 205; Pouliot, 2010: 42-43). In Pouliot’s observation of security communities, when an “axiomatically peaceful logic of practicality sets in, it takes on a dimension of habit or routine. Without instrumental calculations, reflexive rule-following or communicative action about the opportunity of settling disputes non-violently, the security officials’ practical sense leads them to go on diplomatically” (2010: 43). Adler has made such a suggestion as well. He notes that self-restraint is not solely a reflexive action. Rather, self-restraint “is not to be found exclusively in cost-benefit analyses, socialization and persuasion based normative diffusion, or in the moral directives of particular ideological doctrine, such as Kantian liberalism, but also in particular in security-community practices” (2008: 204-205). As he continues, “Self-restraint… is a disposition” (Adler, 2008: 205; see also Bjola and Kornplast, 2007).

Given that habits are likely to emerge within particular contexts and organizational settings (Johnston, 2001; and see also Rosenau, 1986: 863; Adler, 1997: 345) and among the relations of bounded ‘communities of practice’ (Wenger, 1998; Adler, 2008; Adler and Pouliot, 2011), it is possible that particular regional diplomatic habits both exist and serve to structure regional relations in particular ways. This two-part intuition is elaborated at length in Chapter 3 and explored in the empirical chapters that follow. As outlined, the Southeast Asian or South American ‘way’ or ‘diplomatic culture’ may not be limited to consciously referenced norm of appropriateness or prescriptive rules. Rather, distinctive diplomatic relations in each region may founded on deeply taken-for-granted knowledge and unreflected upon practices or habits.
A focus on the habitual and dispositional quality of regional relations has an intuitive appeal. Not only does it complement a focus on consciously referenced norms of regional relations, but it also aligns well with the account of diplomacy known to and lived by practitioners themselves. That diplomacy is more an art than science is a core tenant of scholarship and the reflection of practitioners, and thus suggests a realm of relations wherein particular and unthinking habits may be at work (e.g. Pouliot, 2008: 261).

Further, as explored in the following chapters not only are practitioners themselves often unable to account for how and why diplomacy works in de-escalating conflict or maintaining pacific relations, but they assume inefficacious practices as natural and obvious. Both regions suggest particular and often critiqued versions of ‘normal’ diplomacy and thus suggest habits and dispositional qualities of relations may exist. It is the core intuition of this work, that the inarticulate diplomatic habits in reach region directly influence the patterns of peace that occur in each region. These assertions are explored in detail in the chapters that follow. For now, let me offer a summary of the developments thus far.

2.9 Summary

A number of theoretical propositions seem promising avenues of inquiry to understand cooperation and community building alongside persistent levels of inter-state violence, and to offer insight into the maintenance and management of the conflictual long peace of each region. Following Bennett and Checkel (2014), these alternative explanations are due exploration in tandem with an investigation of my own analytic hunch. I have attempted to cast a wide net for potential explanations. All alternative explanations are due some analytical attention within the empirical cases, and the particulars of each case cannot be lost. As the introduction to this chapter made clear, the intent of this chapter was not to offer an exhaustive test of these varied propositions. Rather, the interest has been in the plausibility of a number of analytic factors.
Many of central pillars of realist and liberal understandings of peace offer little immediate insight into the establishment and maintenance of the long peace apparent in both regions. Traditional and formal balance of power, democracy, economic interdependence, and a functionalist appreciation of organizations appear of little analytical potential. However, there remain a host of potential leads. Of particular importance for this investigation are three—potentially related—propositions: regional state powers, norms and culture, and habitual dispositions.

ASEAN as a particular organizational setting may be consequential for Southeast Asian peace as may be the particular ‘balancing’ dynamic that saw its generation. Regional forums (the OAS, UNASUR) may offer less compelling suggestions for South America, while traditional balancing may have been at work in certain periods. The particulars of each case, then, cannot be discounted and analytical attention must be directed towards these potential factors. There, however, are a number of factors that appear most promising as lines of inquiry common to both cases. From the above investigation two common features appear particularly salient for investigating the foundations of the long and conflictual peace of each region, and each seems relatively intuitive. It is clear that there are variations in the material capability, or power, of regional states in each case and thus some states may matter more than others for the emergence and maintenance of peace in each case. Similarly, and intuitively perhaps, both regions show commonalities in terms of a common cultural or normative order, which may, by a logic of appropriateness, impact state behaviour and make possible sustained peaceful relations. A third common factor, satisfaction with the territorial status quo, it has been argued, can be explored by reference to the cultural and normative settings in which such assumptions are made. The addition of the third potential lead, habit, has been justified primarily by an analytic intuition as well; habit may be at work when long and durable patterns of relations are observed, and stability or peace in these cases may be such a phenomena. This logic is explored in detail in Chapter 3. However, a focus on habit suggests a further utility—and is further justified—as it may complement those two avenues of inquiry that appear most promising here.
2.9.1 Habits and Power

Both regional cases suggest that asymmetries in power as defined may have played a role in the establishment and development of long peace. This is a rather intuitive suggestion, as it is clear that variation in the material capability of states in regional settings may lead to variation in the influence of different states. Whether a regional hegemon in the shape of Brazil in the 1880s and onwards or role of Indonesia as a potential leading state after the 1960s, an asymmetry in capability and influence may impact the development of regional peace.

The suggestion of asymmetric power informing the quality and duration of peace in each region may assume a rational model of state behaviour. Either by deterrence or the threat thereof, states do not escalate their conflict. In the historical record, one could search for decision-makers making use of information in ‘rational’ and intelligent ways, selecting policies that would not escalate conflict if the expected costs outweighed the expected utility. This is one potential avenue to explore in the empirical investigations. Looking to the role of Brazil, and perhaps Indonesia, within the narratives of regional long peace, or looking to the role of external great powers, is thus necessary. Further, in the South American case there was initial cause to suspect that regional balancing may have informed the establishment and continuance of regional peace (at least in the 1970s). However, given the long peace and relatively short periods of regional balancing, the explanatory weight of this dynamic may be already under question. There is a long period of peace, but no corresponding long period of balancing. Nevertheless, attention to this potential explanatory factor is also due in the empirical investigation. If states responded to regional crises and recognized the risks of escalation vis-à-vis regional blocs, there is some cause to assume balancing helps explain these cases.

This focus on material power complements a focus on the diplomatic habits of the region. First, habits themselves may be instrumental in translating material capability into influence. As Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall make clear, power best understood is a relational quality. Power is *practiced*. It “works through social extended, institutionally diffuse relations” (Barnett and Duvall, 2005: 51-52). A particular state “does not
‘possess’ the resources of power, but because A stands in a particular relation to the relevant institutional arrangements, its actions exercise power over B” (see also Duffield, 1994). The habits of each region, as defined and discussed at length in the following chapter, may serve as the medium through which capability has effect. Expressed through unproblematically enacted diplomatic processes and resting on deeply internalized and unreflected upon assumptions of the world and of “normal” diplomatic practice, power may be expressed through habitual relations. Powerful actors (however defined) – those with the loudest voice – may be particularly consequential in regional relations as a result of their assumed leadership. In exploring our regional cases, then, analytical attention should be devoted to evidence of power impacting state behaviour.

2.9.2 Habits and Norms

A second analytical avenue to explore is the importance of the cultural or normative context in which regional states interact. Following the insights of social constructivists, analytical attention could be paid to the active and conscious deference by regional officials to what they assume as appropriate conduct given their social context. One immediate complication arises when attempting to examine the long history of patterned peace through the lens of cultural or normative dynamics. There may be a lag between the emergence of pacific norms and of regional peace itself. For some, this has led to a rejection of this focus as particularly consequential in understanding long peace. For example, in reference to the shared cultural and normative foundation of South America, Kacowicz asks “if these norms were adopted in 1810 or soon after that [period of independence], how can they explain the maintenance of peace since 1883 but not before?” (1998: 104; see also Holsti, 1996: 171). However, and again, a focus on habit serves to answer this critique. Kacowicz’s critique ignores the potential importance of the internalization of norms or the habituation of practices and taken-for-granted knowledge. This is not a surprising omission. A As explored in detail in the following chapter, social

---

13 As Kacowicz’ primary focus is South America and West Africa, he does not apply the same level of analysis to Southeast Asia in this regard as he does South America (see 1998: 102-105; 195-196). However, the same critique may be leveled against a focus on the ‘ASEAN way’ as a cultural product of Southeast Asian traditions (e.g. Acharya, 1998; Ba, 2013; Collins, 2013).
constructivist literature on norms and the more nascent turn to both habit and practice have tended to distance themselves from each other, articulating disparate logics for agency. However, as I explore in the following chapter, there is an important and often underappreciated interrelationship between norms and habitual behaviours. Habits themselves may be the practical expression of global or regional norms, and that expression may occur after the emergence of the norms in a rhetorical or institutionalized sense. Indeed, while international and regional norms leave behind “behavioural traces” recorded in treaties, agreements, and other less than formal institutional means that suggest their emergence or existence, this tells us little about their practice (Bernstein, 2001: 30). The mere extensive of norms of appropriate conduct in official state or IO rhetoric and or as codified in treaties or organizational documents, does not inherently suggest they shape the behaviour of relevant actors. Rather, as I show in the following chapter, it is in habituated practices that global and regional norms have their effect on relations. Though habitual dispositions, state officials embody, act out, and often reify particular and patterned interpretations of norms (see Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 6; Weiner, 2009). Indeed, many international norms are contested in practice (Acharya, 2004; Weiner, 2009), and as I show in the following empirical chapters, are interpreted and expressed in practice in seemingly incongruent ways across different contexts. Thus, there if norms appear a useful avenue to investigation, attention needs to be paid to their practical expressions.

2.10 Conclusion

This chapter has served two preliminary purposes. First, it articulated the puzzle of peace in each case. Both the long peace of Southeast Asia and that of South America suggest puzzlingly empirical records. Both suggest war is an aberration, yet divisive and violent territorial conflict remains pervasive. The lack of escalation in each region is puzzling and suggests the need to explore the conflict management patterns of each case. Second, this chapter has offered the first step in understanding these cases. There is a relative paucity of explanations derived from a preliminary survey of IR’s paradigmatic theories. However, the role of powerful actors and of cultural and normative dynamics appear of potential utility in offering an understanding. Following the intuition of this project, a third approach centered on habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations may
also afford insight. Moreover, attention to the habitual and dispositional nature of regional diplomacy may serve to offer complementary insights to a focus on power and cultural or normative context.

In the following chapter I explore and further justify this focus on habit and practice. I offer a framework centered on dispositional and habitual qualities of regional diplomacy, and introduce the concept of *habitual dispositions* as means to explore this reality. From there, I detail an appropriate methodology and a set of methodological tools suitable to both uncover the existence of regional diplomatic habits and then determine their consequence for patterns of regional conflict management and conflictual, long peace more generally.
Chapter 3.

Habits of Peace: Theory and Framework

3.1 Introduction

Habits are ubiquitous in the social world. For individuals, they serve as the lens through which we come to know and make sense of our self and the world around us. Within groups, they define shared senses of normal and delineate what is assumed possible and efficacious. In so doing, habits delimit behaviour and structure relations – between individuals, groups, societies, and states. Habits, then, ground social relations in predictability and make possible consistency and stability in the social world. However, habits remain surprisingly absent our analytic focus in IR.

In this chapter I offer the justification for this focus, and outline one means to focus directly upon habit in the study of world politics. I build on scholarship in social and IR theory that challenges the dominant focus on agents' choices to suggest that most political and social action, in practice, occurs rather unreflexively. In so doing I draw our analytic attention to the dispositional qualities of relations that generate relatively unthinking responses to everyday interactions and crises alike.

My interest is not in a comprehensive outline of a or the theory of habit. Rather, I offer one means by which focusing on the habitual and dispositional qualities of relations sheds light on important and otherwise often overlooked aspects of social and political world. As explored in detail below, my concept of habitual dispositions suggests a particular understanding of ‘habits’ as sets of taken-for-granted knowledge and the unreflexive behaviours that derive from them. Habitual dispositions precede deliberation and, as a result, they, themselves, structure much of social action. Following the intuition of the previous chapter, the underlying suggestion here is that particular diplomatic habitual dispositions inform particular patterns of long peace. This chapter offers a means to explore this claim and a framework that can travel beyond the bounds of this research.
This chapter is organized across three sections. In the first section I systematize an approach to explore the mundane aspects of inter-state life – “the routine, repetitive, habitual, customary, and everyday” in Ted Hopf’s words (2002: 3). Here, I define habitual dispositions and explore its definitional attributes in some detail, including positing the origins of habit. The second section explores how and why habits matter for the study of world politics. Not only is there a relative dearth of IR scholarship that directly confronts this ubiquitous quality of the social world, but habits matter for IR. As I argue, cognitive and behavioural habits are productive of continuity and stability in the social world and provide a useful framework to explore a host of patterns in IR and long term regional peace in particular. In the third section, I outline the interpretivist research at the heart of this project. I describe my two-part research design, first to uncover habit and then to explore its consequence. Following the assertions made in the previous chapter, and building on recent practice theory, I suggest that attention to the lived world of practitioners is necessary to understand patterns of regional peace. With this in mind, I offer a number of methodological tools to observe and explore cognitive and behavioural habits, and I posit the limitations and complications that stem from such an investigation. Ultimately, the aim of this chapter is to offer a means to attend to habits of diplomatic interaction and a framework from which to develop the empirical investigations that follow.

3.2 Habits, Practices, and Norms

Most social and political action, in practice, occurs unthinkingly. Relatively thoughtless behaviour and sets of understandings structure much of social action for individuals and states. As Emile Durkheim suggests, “by its very nature, human action, whether individual or collective oscillates between two poles, that of consciousness or reflection on the one side, and that of habit on the other side, with the latter pole being stronger” (quoted in Camic, 1986: 1052). In IR, our lack of engagement with this stronger pole of collective and individual agency, then, is puzzling. As Camic perceptively suggests,
whether action is depicted as the pursuit of economic ends via norms of efficiency, or whether more sublime needs and obligatory moral norms are also taken into consideration, the underlying assumption is that the human personality is essentially the aggregate of various end preferences and normative orientations… Missing altogether here is an appreciation… that personality is a good deal more than the tidy sum of attributes like these; that the implications for actual conduct of any particular norms, beliefs, and ideas are highly contingent on the basic cast or form of the whole personality of which these components are parts – on a generalized disposition… (1986: 1076 emphasis added).

This same sentiment colours recent constructivist IR’s frustration with much of IR theory, and much of the response borrows implicitly or explicitly from this suggestion as well. As Pouliot argues (2008; 2010), founded on the logics of consequence, appropriateness or arguing (March and Olsen, 1989; Risse, 2000), much of IR theory starts with an exploration of the conscious reflection of agents prior to action. Be it in reference to materialist structures and incentives or, as the security community literature highlights, the intersubjectively-held but conscious assumptions of ‘we-ness’ in a community (Adler and Barnett, 1998), IR theory suffers from a pervasive “representational bias” (Pouliot, 2008; see also Hopf, 2002). By starting with how and why actors represent themselves and the world, IR theory tends to overlook the reality that much of what actors do and think is shaped prior to reflection. As Hopf notes, “We [in IR] have been ignoring what most people do most of the time in their social lives” (2010: 539). While this lament is a growing one in IR, it is not entirely new to the field. James N. Rosenau suggested much the same more than two decades prior with his observation that we in IR have only “ignorance of the dynamics of habit in world politics” (1986: 889 fn. 63).

This work takes this charge on directly. My goal is to uncover the foundations of the very “imaginability and thinkability of interests and choice” (Hopf, 2002: 283) in an effort to understand how cooperation and community building can exist alongside persistent militarized violence and thus the very foundations of the conflictual peace observed in both Southeast Asia and South America. To this end, my analytical focus builds on the growing turn to both practice (e.g. Adler and Pouliot, 2011) and habit (Hopf, 2010) in IR.

Habits are both cognitive and behavioural. They are sets of deeply held knowledge that generate relatively unthinking responses to situations. Practice suggests a similar
cognitive and behavioural quality of relations. Pouliot (2008; 2010) and others highlight the importance of unreflexive and dispositional knowledge that generates “socially meaningful patterns of action”, or practices (Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 6). In treatments of both habit and practice, practical knowledge is unconsciously self-evident to actors and, as such, makes possible certain behaviour while precluding others (see also Hayes, 2013: 25-27, 31-39; Hopf, 2012: 14-15). This inarticulate “practical sense” or “socially constituted ‘sense of the game’” acts as a lens through which actors confront the world and circumscribes thought and action (Pouliot, 2008: 275; see also Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). In this way, a turn to habit and practice is necessary to understand the lived world and the underlying logic that guides behaviour and establishes patterns of social action. While both are of utility for IR, a turn to either is limiting. The common focus in both the habit- and practice-centred literature on the unreflexive aspects of social relations has drawn the scholars surveyed here away from constructivist work on norms, which too seeks to uncover the foundations of behaviour and patterned social action. This rejection is limiting.

Practice theorists, in particular, tend to articulate and distance themselves from what Ole Jacob Sending (2002) terms a ‘motivationally externalist’ reading of the logic of appropriateness most common to traditional constructivist accounts (see Collins 2013: 16-19; Pouliot, 2008: 262). This understanding of norms and their consequence assumes that conscious reflection on what constitutes appropriate conduct. This reflection, then, guides the reasoned behaviour of actors. In such a view, many international norms leave “behavioral traces,” being recorded in treaties, agreements, and other formal or less than formal means as they are established and internalized by actors who have actively referenced them (Bernstein, 2001: 30). This allows norms to be both verbal and intentional. It is this representational quality that distances a focus on norms from practice and habit in these accounts. As Hopf (2002: 12) summarizes nicely, “Significant features distinguish habitual action from normative compliance. Generally, norms have the form ‘in circumstance X, you should do Y’, whereas habits have a general form more like ‘in circumstance X, action Y follows.’” The same can be said of practice. In this way, these authors suggest, habits and practices are more robust, more resilient, and more
consequential for stability in social relations than are consciously referenced norms of appropriate behaviour. As such, analytical attention to habit and to practice offers a more accurate account of social action than does unearthing the existence of norms of appropriate conduct. What often escapes the turn to a distinct logic of action, however, is that norms and practices are often interrelated (see also Bernstein and Laurence, 2016). This reality suggests the utility of a framework that borrows from both the habit- and practice-centred accounts, but also interrogates the existence and effect of abstract and codified norms alongside them.

International norms tend to be abstract, in that they are open to interpretation, contestation and thus variation in performance (Acharya, 2004; Weiner, 2009). Identifying existing norms alone may highlight collectively held “notions of what appropriate behaviour ought to be” but it tells us little about the behaviour of actors (Bernstein, 2001: 29). For example, as Amitav Acharya (2014: 62) notes, “there is considerable room for doubt whether it [the set of norms of the ‘ASEAN way’] has been upheld in practice.” This is precisely the point of interest here. On the one hand, unearthing the normative foundations upon which actors reflect appears of limited utility if the actual behaviour of actors is the interest. With an identification of norms alone, it is not clear on how or if such assumptions of appropriate conduct are followed or consequential. On the other, it is not clear that a turn to those habits and those practices which are indeed unreflexively utilized need be entirely divorced from the abstract and codified norms many constructivists, such as Acharya above, are wont to highlight. Rather, in competent practices the particular and intersubjective meaning and unproblematic behaviour that stems from abstract norms are apparent. It is the competent quality of practices that provides insight into this point.

Competence is a necessarily subjective quality. It requires recognition within a community (Adler, 2008: 201; Gheciu, 2005: 16). This social quality is something Adler and Pouliot highlight to distance their understanding of practices, as competent performances, from habits, which they understand as necessarily individualistic and thus absent social meaning (2011b: 6-7). This is a restrictive view of habit, as habits may also
be socially-held and socially-meaningful, as explored above. Regardless of the semantic distinction, it is clear that actors tend to engage in iterated practices or habits that they and their community perceive as effective. As Rosenau summarizes, “a person is usually well severed by her habits. They get her through a variety of situations and enable her to meet a variety of challenges. So there are good reasons to be comfortable as a habit-driven actor, and as such, to eschew capricious behavior” (1986: 862). In this estimation habits are known to be effective by those who perform them. They are interpreted along community-held standards (Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 6). In Adler and Pouliot’s (2011a/b) estimation, practices tend to ‘work’ in that practices embody, act out, and often reify action-oriented background knowledge – they get things done in the eyes of those who perform them. An aspect of this assumed utility is often a perceived, or self-evident, sense of legitimacy (Little, 2011: 186). In this way, actors tend to simply know that their practices work and know them to be legitimate. As Iver B. Neumann (2002: 637) suggests, “practice speaks: this is how we have always done things around here.” These social qualities – of perceived legitimacy and interpreted efficacy – suggest that practices and habits are likely to vary within communities holding different understandings of legitimacy and efficacy. In short, “how things are done” among different communities of practitioners may vary despite common aims and interests.

Indeed, as the empirical chapters that follow show, patterns of understandings differ sharply and common, even global norms may be internalized and practiced differently across communities of diplomatic practitioners. Habituated practices embody, act out, and often reify particular and patterned interpretations of norms and afford them particular and patterned behavioural expressions (Adler and Pouliot, 2011b: 4; Weiner, 2009). The relationship between codified norms and the practices that stem from – and often complicate or contest – them may be glimpsed through a turn to habit and practice and attention to the self-evident competence therein. For example, as Chapter 5 demonstrates, from an external standpoint there appear important differences between norms codified in the founding ASEAN Declaration of 1967 and the Charter signed forty years later and the habituated practices that are enacted and encountered daily as self-evident by regional practitioners. Southeast Asian regional diplomatic practices of
peaceful dispute resolution, for example, are assumed incompetent in the eyes of European officials working alongside ASEAN. Yet from the intra-regional perspective there is a sense of competence – there is a clear fit between norm and practice, and efficacy in practice. Reference to the same set of norms often means fundamentally different things to different communities who have filled norms with distinct behavioural predispositions. It is for this reason, that an appreciation of the particular practical, habitual and dispositional character of relations is important to understand patterns of behaviour among differing communities.

To better explore these practical, dispositional, and habitual aspects of regional relations I offer the analytical concept of habitual dispositions – phrasing that denotes the core suggestion of the cognitive and behaviour elements of social relations and distances itself from the mechanistic understanding of habit outlined by Hopf (2010).

3.3 Habitual Dispositions

Building on the literature surveyed above, I offer the concept of _habitual dispositions_. This focus offers one means to explore the practical, dispositional, and habitual qualities of relations and affords the possibility of investigation if and how largely abstract and codified norms inform relatively unthinking, and thus particular consequent behaviour. This concept rests on three key assertions. First, habitual dispositions exist prior to reflection, as predispositions towards certain behaviours in a given context. While they are temporally and spatially contingent once established, habitual dispositions shape perception and practice. Second, analytically these dispositional qualities can be conceptualized in terms of knowledge and practice – or as both content and process. Third, they emerge in and are shared by groups of actors, or bounded communities of practice.

3.3.1 Prior to Reflection

Habitual dispositions can be understood as “ontologically prior” to other logics of action (Pouliot, 2008: 277). They exist prior to reflection in a strict sense, and as an inherent
impulse that is more or less unthinking (Kahneman, 2003; Hopf, 2010: 542-543). They suggest sets of proclivities, rather than structurally determined responses to stimuli. However, they are temporally and spatially contingent – habits emerge in and through practice and from internalizing knowledge once reflected upon within particular communities of practitioners. Importantly, however, once established habitual dispositions shape perception and practice, be it in reference to the risks, rewards, or perceived appropriateness of action.

One caveat may be offered at this point. Habit suggests nothing of the efficacy or complexity of habit, only its placement outside and before active reflection. Habit needs not be assumed good, bad, optimal or otherwise. As Bourdieu (1990) recognized, social action may indeed be reasonable without being reasoned (see Pouliot and Merand, 2013: 31). On the latter issue, Kahneman recognizes that intuition may be complex and efficacious: “The proverbial master chess player who walks past a game and declares, ‘White mates in three,’ without slowing is performing intuitively, as is the experienced nurse who detects subtle signs of impending heart failure” (2003: 699). Indeed, “skilled decision makers often do better when they trust their intuitions than when they engage in detailed analysis” (Kahneman, 2003: 699).

3.3.2 Habits as Process and Content

Second, these deeply internalized qualities of relations can be analytically parsed out along two lines. Habits can be conceptualized in terms of both processual attributes and particular substantive content – habitual dispositions are comprised of background knowledge and inherently naturalized practices.¹⁴

Habit rests upon intuitive thought or predispositions – sets of assumed and unproblematic truths taken to be a sense of normal. This has been recognized as a “practical sense” and “a socially constituted ‘sense of the game’” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 120-121, quoted in Pouliot 2008, 275). From this assumed normal stems, relatively axiomatically,

¹⁴ A similar analytic distinction is made within psychology literature (e.g. Verplaken 2010: 74, 77). In IR, Mariano Bertucci (2014) makes the same distinction in his study of foreign policy stability.
particular and meaningful practices. Habit does not suggest fixed or mechanical responses to stimuli, “devoid of meaning from the actor’s point of view” (Camic 1986 1046; and see Crossley 2013, 148). Rather, habitually enacted practices are better understood as variable forms or classes of action that stem directly from intuitive thought and predispositions. Again, this does not suggest habit in practice is limited to simple actions. Habit may suggest both “simple and circumscribed” action and action that is both “generalized and complex,” but action that stems from relatively unreflected upon viewpoints (Camic, 1986: 1045).

Furthermore, habit in this sense does not deny agency. Rather, habit suggests agency as bounded within less than conscious knowledge of the world. From this prior foundation, particular repertoires of action are produced as natural and given responses to contextualized stimuli. The agency that stems from habitual responses to stimuli is not obviated, but rather limited and scoped. Such an understanding has been long recognized in psychology. For example, Stanovich and West (2000) articulate two systems of cognition, that of intuition and that of reasoning. Habit is inherent in the first. Intuition suggests relatively effortless, fast, and associative processes while reasoning denotes slow, controlled and rule-governed processes. Both suggest individuals rely on abstract concepts, but intuition also involves generalized precepts, a distinction in the content of these cognitive systems (see Kahneman, 2003: 698-699).

This particular understanding of habit butts against the term’s recent use in IR, and aligns better with the recent developments in practice theory. Hopf (2010) offers a particularly narrow reading of habit. Rather than treating it as bounded agency, Hopf assumes habit as mechanistic in its dictates. That Hopf concludes that the “fuller implications” of habit suggest the “elimination of rationality, agency and uncertainty” (2010: 544) in social action seems to invite a similar lament to many who survey the concept’s evolving usage in sociology (e.g. Crossley, 2013). Camic (1986), for example, surveys the development of the terminology around ‘habit’ and suggests that the transition in linguistic use from ‘habit’ to ‘habitus’ does not denote the development of a novel concept. Rather, the semantic recourse to ‘habitus’ was a move largely in effort to distance some from the
distorted appropriation of the concept by particular behaviourist sociologists keen to associate ‘habit’ with mechanistic and deterministic responses to stimuli, something mirrored in IR with Hopf’s usage. Park notes this keenly when he suggests that what we do “when we behave most like human beings [is] pretty sure to escape the behaviorists ‘who focus on habits’” (quoted in Camic, 1986: 1073). Similarly, as Cossley observes, “The reason that writers such as Mauss and Bourdieu argue for a conception of habitus over a conception of habit, I believe, is because the concept of habit has been distorted and on this basis discredited in the course of intellectual history. It is probable that these particular writers recognize this distortion and adopt ‘habitus’ for purely strategic reasons” (2013: 143). As he continues, such thinkers “recognize that ‘habit’ need not imply mechanical repetition but recognize also that this is how it often is conceived” (ibid.). Just as the limited behaviorist view of habit seemed at odds with human action for Park and Faris and Mauss and Bourdieu, so too does Hopf’s habit seem at odds with agency in IR and with earlier uses of ‘habit’ in that field (i.e. Rosenau 1986, 862).15

Rather than denying agency, then, habit better denotes the dispositional nature of much of social interaction. As Dewey obverses, and in parallel to the assumptions inherent in Bourdieu’s habitus (1992), “habits are arts. They involve skill of sensory and motor organs, cunning or craft, and objective materials. They assimilate objective energies, and eventuate in command of an environment. They require order, discipline and manifest technique” (quoted in Crossley 2013, 150). Habit implies a proclivity towards classes of action, but not a mechanistic or determined act. Agency remains, however circumscribed.

3.3.3 Collectively-Held Habits

Thirdly, in all the accounts of habit, practice, or routine touched upon here, the context in which social action occurs is consequential. Pouliot (2008; 2010) confronts this most directly, suggesting the importance of overlapping Bourdieusian ‘fields’ or relational spaces (see also Pouliot and Mérand 2012). In this account, agents and collectives are beholden to context- or field-specific dispositions or habitus. The product of past

---

15 It is largely to ensure that the use of ‘habit’ here is not confused with a mechanistic behavioural response to stimuli, that I offer a focus on ‘habitual dispositions’. With this distinction made clear, I will use ‘habit’ interchangeably as shorthand for ‘habitual disposition’ going forward.
experiences and interactions, durable dispositions generate propensities and tendencies towards certain practices (Pouliot, 2008: 272). They imbue social interactions among groups of practitioners with an innate practical sense of normalcy. Jennifer Mitzen inherently relies on a similar assumption. Following from Giddens, she draws attention to the routinization of relations that offer individuals and states ontological security – continuity in the self that makes possible social action (2006a). Driven by this need, in Mitzen’s account, individuals and states alike create cognitive and behavioural certainty through the establishment of routines or habits of relations with significant others. The effect is to dispose actors towards certain types of behaviour axiomatically (see also Rosenau 1986, 863). Thus, a particular and repeatedly enacted set of “normal” practices emerges as a result of a particular context or setting, and emerges as the property of collectivities therein.

The recognition of group-held habits has a long history. Durkheim, for example, saw habit as the collectively held property that propelled societies forward, and often to less than optimal outcomes (Camic 1986, 1051-1052; and see Durkheim 1895). His views on primitive societies and the modern division of labour (e.g. 1893), and even suicide (1897), were all informed by his belief that the unreflexive knowledge – habituated knowledge – structured social practice through collectively-held habits (see Camic, 1986, 1051-1053). From such a claim Durkheim founded his normative aspiration to impact primary education such that individuals might internalize secularly moral and just habits of action and thought at a young age and with immense impact on social affairs (see Camic, 1986). Despite profound differences in interests and method Weber offers a similar foundation in his much of his work. He suggests habit or \textit{Eingestellthiet} as a collectively held and conditioned disposition towards replicating practices from the past unreflexively (Weber, 1978). Dewey, too, suggests that of particular importance are group-held customs in a similar sense to the above uses of habit. By definition, customs are collectively held. Groups generate, and through socialization pass on, customs

\footnote{For Mitzen, \textit{routines} are habitual by definition. As she later describes, “Ontological security-seeking, then, is the drive to minimize the awareness of fundamental uncertainty by trying to impose cognitive order on the environments through routines, \textit{by which we mean habitual cognitive and behavioral responses to information or stimuli}” (Mitzen and Schweller 2011: 29, emphasis added).}
through purposive design or incidental action (1922: 15-21, 43-7). While individuals may have their own and personalized habits, societal habits are of particular importance in structuring and patterning social relations over time. As with the aspiration of Durkheim, Dewey therefore saw a possibility of entrenching particular collectively-habits through education. Habituating critical inquiry and observation as well as compassion for others, for example, may lead society to internalize habits that can better effect positive social change (1922: 127-28).

Habits, then, are likely to exist across various of levels of aggregation, from the individual to entire societies. The interest of this work is narrower than that of Dewey, Durkheim and Weber, as briefly surveyed. Rather, the focus here is on the habitual dispositions of bounded communities of practice within and beyond organizations – groups of individuals in regularized interaction wherein societal, individual, and other habits may all be at play, but where particular iterations of interaction may yield distinctive and commonly held dispositional traits to interactions (see Adler 2008; Adler and Poulion 2011). Such bounded communities and social environments are of the focus of investigations in unique practices and taken-for-granted norms in IR. When Neumann perceptively notes that, “practice speaks: this is how we have always done things around here” (2002, 637), it is clear that ‘around here’ is a distinct and bounded community.

Habits are the qualities of individuals, communities, and even entire societies. The interest here is at a lower level of aggregation and with particular communities of diplomatic practitioners, within and beyond formal organizational settings. To explore how and why habits may exist in such contexts, one can explore the origins of habit.

### 3.4 The Origins of Habit

While sociologists have debated variation in habitual behaviour and explored habits across a wide breath of social relations (e.g. Camic, 1986), less attention has been paid to their origins. While relatively stable, habits are not innate. They are acquired through social interaction within institutionalized settings, given their “relatively closed networks
of mutual influence” (Crossley 2013, 155; see also Hopf 2010: 547, 550, Adler 1997: 345; Johnston 2001; Neumann 2007; Pouliot 2011). As Margaret Archer notes, two mutually reinforcing factors are particularly consequential in generating habituation: a low level of structural differentiation among actors and a low level of ideational diversification (2010, 281-282). Hopf (2010) suggests much the same as well. For him, institutional settings are the most likely sites to see the logic of habit emerge and operate. Through routine action, standard operating procedures, and a relative insulation from competing ideological structures, habits may emerge and may have their greatest structural affect through iteration in these settings (Hopf, 2010: 547). This mirrors conclusions from socialization literature as well, which highlights the consequence of closed institutional or organizational settings (e.g. Johnston, 2001; and see also Rosenau, 1986: 863; Adler, 1997: 345). Given the sustained interaction within a more insulated context with relatively de-politicized in-camera situations, such settings have been assumed key sites for socialization through a host of social mechanisms (Checkel, 2005a/b; Lewis, 2005).

The acquisition of habits may be active through reflexive teaching and learning, or through unconscious adoption and mimicry (Hopf, 2010: 541-542; Pouliot, 2010: 31-32; Verplaken, 2010: 70; Williams, 2007: 25-26). Like all practices, habits begin as “stories” (Neumann, 2002; Pouliot, 2012). These narratives provide “authoritative definitions of truth and morality” and, in turn, guide behaviour (Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 21). Of particular importance are the actions of powerful and authoritative actors (Alder-Nissen and Pouliot, 2014; Pouliot, 2008: 282). These actors are able to impose meaning within a particular community of actors through practice where acting as if certain behaviours are natural may be self-fulfilling (Finnemore, 1996: 30; Pouliot, 2008: 283). However, as Kathryn Sikkink observes, “powerful individuals are important for the adoption of ideas, but if these ideas do not find institutional homes, they will not be able to sustain themselves over the long term” (1991: 248). Thus, power may matter for the adoption of new ideas, the development of normalized and habituated behaviours and practices, but some form of institutionalization is required for their longevity.
This basic claim is consistent with constructivist literature on norm emergence and internalization, and hints at the underexplored interdependence between practices and norms (e.g. Checkel, 2005; Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Hoffmann 2005). In this formulation, teaching and learning may be implicit or explicit, and in time there is an “appropriative moment” when a once reflected upon practice shifts to the unconscious background (Mitzen, 2006a: 36).  

These new practices and habits do not emerge in a vacuum. They are nested within existing and overlapping practices, norms and, in this case, regional narratives that unite a community (see Neumann, 2005: 635-636; Pouliot, 2012: 214-215). As such, ‘new’ ways of understanding the world and novel practices must resonate with local perceptions of both appropriateness and efficacy – to be assumed to work in practice (Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 22; Axelrod, 1986: 1097; Crossley, 2013: 152).

Habits, then, emerge from precedent and iteration, but are influenced by authoritative actors and perceptions of efficacy. As competent performances, these practical aspects of relations are necessarily shaped by existent and collectively shared expectations. In this

---

17 It is worth noting that in Pouliot’s logic of practice, background knowledge and unreflexive practices experience no shift from reflection to not by agents. There is no active learning and there is no appropriative moment or point of deep internalization. Rather, practical knowledge is “unreflexive and inarticulate through and through” (2008: 265). This founds a critique of Sending (2002) and the internalist constructivist position, which assumes internationalization and potentially habituation through reflexive learning (2008: 263). As with the local metis knowledge – “a sixth sense that comes with long practice” (Scott, 1998: 328) – practical sense generates actions without reflection and without teaching (Pouliot 2008: 270). Tacit or implicit learning produces background knowledge in this account, just as infants learn their mother tongue in and through inherent practice, not reflection (Pouliot, 2008: 272; Reber, 1993) Such a claim mirrors that of Merleau-Ponty, who suggests habits are formed through ongoing interactions in which particular actions are assumed successful and iterated in practice (see Crossley, 2013: 151). Hopf’s (2010) articulation of the logic habit and Mitzen’s interest in routine and habit (2006a/b), however, both assume some appropriative moment, when once reflected upon norms and practices are no longer. However, it can be noted that despite Pouliot’s rejection of the appropriative moment, he assumes powerful actors can consciously act as if action and knowledge are natural and thereby cause their naturalness. For example, he notes that in the case of the transatlantic community, powerful and authoritative security agents practice diplomacy as if it were self-evident in an attempt to buttress their power. In his words, “By systematically practicing diplomacy as if such a move were self-evident, dominant security elites from the transatlantic community make their counterparts see that things have changed – that peaceful change has become the “normal” way of behaving, as part of the (unthought) order of things” (Pouliot, 2008: 283; see also 2010: 31). His suggestion is that this becomes so and thus some ‘moment’ of internalization must occur. This is a claim others in the constructivist camp may agree with, for purposeful action can generate self-evident norms and knowledge (e.g. Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Neumann, 2002; Finnemore, 2003 and 2005).
way, they may often relate to particular understandings of largely abstract and codified norms, filling them with concrete meaning and orientating them towards action. Once pushed into the cognitive background these habitual and dispositional qualities serve to circumscribe thought and behaviour and define ‘normal’ relations.  

### 3.5 Summary

Borrowing from common assertions of social and practice theory, three definitional qualities of habitual dispositions have been outlined. Habitual dispositions exist as prior to reflection. They are comprised of both unreflected upon knowledge and the axiomatically enacted practices that stem from it – an element of both cognitive substance and practice or process. Informed by precedent and iteration, habitual dispositions are more likely to occur in particular organizational settings or environments and to be held collectively therein. This understanding of habitual dispositions borrows heavily from recent practice literature and is intended as a complement. It serves to narrow analytical focus directly upon habit. It tells us to focus on the background of cognition and to appreciate the practices that derive from this axiomatically and repetitively, as part of the “normal” way of interaction. In so doing, it also alludes to the likely interrelationship between practice and norms, wherein habitual dispositions often represent tactile and inarticulate understandings and competent performances of norms in action. In the following section, I ask – does habit matter?

### 3.6 Habit Matters

Habitual dispositions imbue complex social interaction with a sense of normalcy and thereby pattern social relations. Through this means, habitual dispositions are

---

18 On how habits end, see Hopf (2010: 284) and Stein (2011).

19 On the importance of habitual practice and unreflexivity in this regard within sociological literature see both Crossley’s (2013) more recent survey of habit, and Camic’s (1986) seminal treatment of the concept. Such a claim is central to constructivist thinking in IR (i.e. Hopf, 1998: 178-179). Many constructivists suggest that social action is shaped if not determined by knowledge and practices that are not consciously reflected upon by agents (e.g. Neumann 2002; Mitzen 2006a; Adler 2008). This line of argument also parallels psychological understandings of foreign policy-making (e.g. Welch 2005, esp. Chapter 2) and
themselves a source of stability in social relations. We can see that habitual dispositions are a “phenomenon that makes people do what they would not otherwise have done” and thus “is a phenomenon of power” (Neumann, 2002: 637).

Habits produce stability and continuity. Across levels of analysis, many suggest that social action is shaped (Neumann, 2002; Mitzen, 2006a/b; Bjola and Kornprobst, 2007; Adler, 2008; Pouliot, 2008; Adler and Pouliot, 2011; Sending and Neumann, 2011) if not determined (Hopf, 2010) by knowledge and practices that are more or less unconsciously held and enacted by agents. Wherever one looks, habits are at play and serve to both constitute social actors and structure social relations. These deeply interrelated claims – that habit informs actors and patterns social relations – emerge in all the accounts surveyed and suggest a starting point to explore the consequence of habits for regional peace.

In Crossley’s view “our very agency depends upon” habit (2013: 151). Such a claim aligns with Camic’s suggestion that the “stable inner core” of actors themselves, as well as the stable social relations in which they engage, emerge from their habituated responses to the social world (1986: 1046). The same dynamic is asserted of the inter-state level as well. States, like individuals, are assumed driven by habitual and dispositional qualities of thought and action. Rosenau (1986), for example, suggests that states themselves are inherently and predominately “habit-driven” in their relations. Bjola and Kornprobst (2007) argue similarly. They explore the state-held *habitus of restraint* that makes possible security community relations (see also Pouliot, 2010: 280; Adler, 2008: 205). Mitzen relies on similar assumptions in here exploration of stability in state

---

20 Pouliot (2008; 2010) argues that naturalized practices are distinct from habits as defined by Hopf (2010), in particular. The core difference in this account is that practices are not learned nor taught. Adler (2008) suggests the same, divorcing “dispositions” from habits for similar reasons. However, Adler is not entirely consistent with this claim – or at least not language. In earlier work, he recognizes that individuals may “learn… new habits slowly, as background conditions change” (2005: 215). The debate over the emergence of habits, practices, and dispositions, is largely moot for my interest. It is clear that regional diplomatic habits, as I have defined them, can be learned in and through practice and or explicitly taught. In my ASEAN interviews, for example, it is clear that practitioners think from a set of habituated practices and the background knowledge that makes them possible. However, for many interviewees, once forced to
relations. She argues that states’ ontological security in inter-state relations is made possible through routinizing (2006a) or habituating (2006b) relations with significant state-others. As Adler and Pouliot observe more generally, “Stability… is an illusion created by the recursive nature of practice” (2011: 16). Similarly and more explicitly, in Crossley’s succinct view, “Whatever consistency can be identified in our conduct and experience derives from interlocking and mutually reinforcing habits” (2013: 150).

The basic understanding that underpins these claims is that actors’ beliefs and actions constantly recreate the structures that bound their interactions, serving to both “evoke and suppress action” (Hopf, 2010: 548). Habit serves to influence what is perceived what is not perceived, what is done and what is not done (Hopf, 2010: 542; see also Lebow, 2009: 215 and Neumann, 2011: 238). Archer, borrowing from Mouzelis (1998: 492), offers a similar conclusion with an explicit reference to social habits. By prescribing actions and denying others, habit is “constitutive of goals and actions. It does not merely set limits to what may occur, it constantly and directly influences what does occur” (2010: 283). The obviation of the possibility of certain action and a proclivity towards others provides for stability in social relations. Social interaction is never in stasis and “over time, actors reify or transform the foundational understandings through their actions and interactions” (Hoffmann, 2005: 115). Any presumed stability in social relations is, then, the product of the iteration and reproduction. As Archer concisely contends, “Nothing social is self-sustaining” (2010: 276). Habit serves this stabilizing function inherently.

Habit’s role in bounding action and producing continuity in and of the self and in and of state relations, then, seems of essential interest for IR, yet we are only recently endeavoring to explore its existence and effect. Moreover, a focus on habit attends to a growing critique of this literature and of socialization literature more generally (see Checkel, 2014b). As noted, habit does not suggest that taken-for-granted aspects of

reflected on habituated behaviour and the assumptions that make them possible, they revealed that they in fact that “at one time” felt them odd, only to naturalize them as unproblematic realities. There is, therefore, a likely transition from fore- to background, and from querying behaviours to enacting them relatively automatically within particular communities as response to particular stimuli.
relations produce only normatively ‘good’ ends. Rather, habits may produce good, bad,
and more likely mixed and suboptimal outcomes ends resting between these judgments.\textsuperscript{21}

Stability in social relations across levels of analysis, then, is affected through the
establishment of proclivities to engage in previously adopted practices as natural and to
accept previously adopted knowledge as unproblematic. Stability is, primarily and most
importantly, a matter of habit. From this account, inter-state peace itself, far from a
negative definition as the absence of war, can be understood as an active and recursive
process made possible by unreflexive knowledge and habituated practices – \textit{habits of
peace} (see also Adler, 2008: 205; Pouliot, 2010: 42-43).

Without making it explicit, Hayes (2012: 2013) offers an account that approaches this
suggestion with his examination of the democratic peace and the central mechanism that
makes it possible, democratic public identity.\textsuperscript{22} Inherently, his social identity approach
relies on habit, as he suggests that implicit assumptions of self and other are foundational
to threat perception and thus bound and scope state action prior to reflection (see 2013:
25-27; 31-39). Similarly, and again without making such a reliance explicit, Pouliot
suggests a parallel logic with his observation that when an “axiomatically peaceful logic
of practicality sets in, it takes on a dimension of habit or routine. Without instrumental
calculations, reflexive rule-following or communicative action about the opportunity of
settling disputes non-violently, the security officials’ practical sense leads them to go on
diplomatically” (2010: 43). Acharya (2014), too, comes near an appreciation of this
reality within ASEAN through his application of the security community framework.
Without exploring it in detail, he notes in passing a “long term habit” of peaceful state
interaction in the region. Further, and again without making it explicit, he suggests the
importance of the particular context or field that makes possible this habit. He notes that
it is intriguing that the ‘ASEAN way’ exists, despite “differing kinds of national identity

\textsuperscript{21} This work may still fall victim to the Checkel’s critique of constructivist literature’s narrow focus on the
‘good’ or on “patterns of order and cooperation” over the ‘bad’ of world politics (2014b: 13; see also Paul, 2012: 15). However, as explored, a focus on habitual dispositions allows investigation of any pattern of
stable relations, and each empirical case (Chapters 4 and 5) suggests, the inefficacious nature of habitual
diplomatic practices of each region, something brought into further relief in the conclusion Chapter 6.

\textsuperscript{22} I thank Jarrod Hayes for his suggestion of this point in an early version of this work.
prevailing among its members” (2014: 25). His suggestion, inherently, is that within the particular community of ASEAN diplomatic practitioners, a set of habituated practices may be at work and generative of peaceful inter-state relations. As such, this suggestion thus far is that a focus on the dispositional and habitual quality of inter-state relations may afford an understanding of the patterned social action we know as peace and thus may help us to understand the observable and particular patterns of relations in each regional case outlined in the previous chapter. In short, practical habits of inter-state relations may undergird long-term regional peace.

Taking stock of the above survey, we can summarize that habitual dispositions:

1. Exist as largely prior to reflection
2. Are comprised of process and content
3. Are collectively-held
4. Have their origins within social and institutionalized settings
5. Produce stability and continuity

From this foundational discussion stems two lines of inquiry: how to unearth the existence of habitual dispositions within particular communities of practice, and how to observe and explore their consequence. I turn now to one means of attending to these ends.

3.7 Research Design and Method

What would one expect to see if habit is at work? In other words, what elements of understanding would support a claim that habitual dispositions are productive of patterned relations among states? And, more precisely, how might habitual dispositions shape regional conflict management?

In answering these questions two distinct specifications must be made. First, habits must be uncovered and observed, if indirectly – they must be shown to actually exist within a community under study. Second, their consequence for an outcome must be articulated.

---

23 Jacobs (2014) perceptively notes that all ideational understandings inherently must rely on indirect observations of their assumed mechanisms. Habit is a mechanism (explored below) is both ideational and practical, and thus suggests, at least in part, the need to rely on indirect means of appraisal as described below.
– not only their existence, but their effect must be documented. This dual research interest is summarized in Table 1. Each of these distinct, but related, investigations beckons a particular methodology and methodological tools explored below.

**Table 1. Research Design Summary**

1. Uncovering Habitual Dispositions: Existence
   a. Derive from within-community practitioners (Chapter 4, 5)
   b. Derive from external practitioners – contrast habits within case (Chapter 4, 5)
   c. Contrast habits across cases (Chapter 6)

2. Assessing the Consequence of Habit: Effects
   a. Articulate robust habits (Chapter 4, 5)
   b. Trace habits in action (Chapter 4, 5)
   c. Contrast different habits with different effects across cases (Chapter 6)

The logic of this design is borrowed from the suggestions of Bennett and Checkel (2014: 30) and Jacobs (2014: 45; 48-49) among others (e.g. Pouliot 2010, Chapter 3). In particular I follow, but amend, Jacobs’ suggestions that any argument with an ideational component must accomplish three things (2014: 45). They must provide evidence that decision-makers held particular cognitions; that those cognitions impacted their choices; and that those cognitions were not solely the product of the material features of the circumstances of choice (see also Checkel, 2014c: 89-91). Here, I seek to provide evidence of two things:

1. that regional practitioners, themselves, hold particular cognitions (*collectively held innate knowledge and distinct and unproblematic understandings of ‘normal’ regional relations and diplomacy*), and;

2. that those cognitions impact regional inter-state relations by circumscribing behaviour (*that they produced relatively axiomatic practices that, in turn, undergird regional conflict management*).

The remainder of this chapter outlines the underlying methodology and offers a number of particular methods to pursue these two interests, after first articulating the starting assumptions of this investigation.
3.8 Starting Assumptions

Before outlining further the methodology employed to make these two specifications, let me pause to offer three starting assumptions that undergird them.

First, I assume that diplomatic interactions occur in a relatively bounded world of iterated interactions within an “organized social context” (Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 10). The interest of this investigation is in bounded “communities” of regional diplomatic practitioners – including regional organizational officials, foreign ministry officials and staff, ambassadors and permanent representatives, and a host of technocratic specialists working within and beyond regional IOs and foreign ministries – and the habitual and dispositional qualities of interactions therein. For the sake of continuity, I use the term “community” to denote this bounded grouping of individuals, while others have referred to them as either “community of practice” (e.g. Wenger 1998; Adler, 2008; Adler and Pouliot, 2011) or using the wider Bourdieusian concept of “field” to isolate a particular context and group of actors therein (e.g. Pouliot, 2010). Diplomacy, here, refers to communications between the agents of states to signal the interest of those states, inherently a pacific quality of interaction and one centered upon expectations of cooperation. With this in mind, however, a field is not ‘out there’ and discoverable in a strict sense. Rather, it is an analytical tool derived from observations that situates actors within structures of power, struggles, and understanding (Pouliot and Merand, 2012: 30). We can observe the existence and often fuzzy bounds of a particular “community” of practitioners by looking for the limits of the field of intersubjective knowledge and through evidence of its effect, even if we cannot perceive this directly (see also Adler, 2002: 14-15). A community may be centered around or exist within a particular organization, such as with ASEAN in Southeast Asia, but the communities of practitioners may also have porous boundaries and extend beyond a singular organization to many (see Lipson, 2007: 9). In the sense used here, a “community” references an

---

24 On defining state-centric diplomacy see Bull (2002: 156-177) and Mayall (2008). For a lengthy discussion of diplomacy as distinct from foreign policy and varieties of diplomatic “styles” see Rathbun (2014: 11-21). On variation in diplomacy that allow non-state actors reference, see Sharp (2009) and Cooper, Heine and Thakur (2013). It is this latter point that sees some definitions suggest only one party to diplomacy need be the agent of the state (e.g. Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2009: 2).
existent and bounded grouping of individuals, but also – as with “field” – is an analytical tool that can be to assemble the world for investigation. This latter suggestion borrows from Pouliot and others who recognize a “field” as a type of a topographical map. It serves to narrows and bound an analytical investigation.

Again, for this study, the analytical interests are the communities of regional state official within each regional case. In Southeast Asia, this means the ASEAN member state diplomats, staff, and officials working within and alongside the ASEAN Secretariat and other regional institutions who differentiate themselves from their non-regional partners working closely with the ASEC. In South America, this means the diplomats, staff, and officials from the twelve South American states working within and alongside the OAS and elsewhere in the South American region, who again differentiate themselves from others working within and alongside the OAS, including practitioners from Central and North America and the Caribbean. As the empirical chapters make clear, each community of practitioners assumes a basic and exclusionary unity themselves – one that means that practitioners from ASEAN member states, themselves, know they are distinct from practitioners from ASEAN Dialogue Partners like South Korea, Japan, or Australia, and that South American practitioners at the OAS know themselves to be distinct, and unified in that distinction, in comparison to their OAS colleagues from Mexico, the CARICOM states, or the USA for example. Understood this way, investigating particular communities helps us explain how norms have their effect, but also the bounds of where and how habits of interaction are of consequence.

Second, by focusing on the interactions within these communities, the actors operating there can be understood as corporate agents of the state. Their identities are largely shaped and generated by their status as representatives of a particular state, and reified by ongoing, often regularized interactions with other such agents. Iterated interactions within this realm pull individuals away from ‘themselves’ as individual actors and towards corporate sense of self, but at the same time generate a sense of communal membership among practitioners. Herein, differences are reproduced as non- or at least less threatening than it may otherwise be, given the interpersonal quality of relations. For
example, as a prominent Indonesian governmental official working closely with issues of ASEAN regionalism, Dewi Fortuna Anwar, suggested to me in an interview, “Tempers flare between the navies of Malaysia and Indonesia over our maritime boundaries. But, at the higher level we say, ‘you know, we’ve got the TAC and we cannot resolve disputes through conflict or war.’” At this “higher level” and within the diplomatic community of each region, regional diplomatic practitioners interact in particularized ways that are relatively removed from public scrutiny. This allows regional practitioners within this community to “know” that they have certain potentials for behaviour, and to preclude reflection on potential others. It allows them to understand and practice regional norms, rules, and principles in particular ways, as natural, self-evident, and effective. At the same time through this community of interactions, practitioners distance themselves from their national contexts and pull towards each other. As James Mayall notes with some jest, “And it is true that much as dog-owners are said to resemble their dogs, diplomats often seem to have more in common with each other than with those they allegedly represent” (2008: 1). The boundaries of that similarity-generating collective are observable through my research design, as outlined below.

The third, and related, assumption is that while bounded and limited there is social continuity over time in these communities. Individual agents change, but many of the common practices and understandings within a community of practitioners remain relatively static (see Scott, 2003: 29). Of course, practices do evolve and change as well. Interpretations of the world are dynamic and are at times rejected and replaced with offers. This project does not discount this, but assumes a basic continuity in normalized and naturalized practices within particular communities of practitioners and demonstrates this within cases.

25 Interview with Dewi Fortuna Anwar, Jakarta, June 25, 2014. Interviewees quoted in this work are generally anonymous unless, of course, noted otherwise. This reflects the wishes of interviewees and/or ethical concerns after the fact. Interviews for the Southeast Asian case took place in Jakarta, Indonesia in June and July 2014. Interviews for the South American case took place in Washington, DC, in September and October 2014. All were conducted in English, the working language of each organization.

26 This sentiment is explored in greater detail in Chapter 4 (see also Acharya, 1998: 208).
With these three assumptions laid out, how can we recognize and uncover the existence of habits among regional practitioners? And, how can we understand their consequence or effects for regional relations and beyond? I explore the methodology and methods of addressing these questions in turn.

**3.9 Recognizing and Uncovering the Existence of Habit**

Recognizing habit is a methodological challenge. Habits are not only repetitive – a necessary but not sufficient definitional condition – but also characterized by a degree of axiomatic action (see Verplaken, 2010: 71-72). The unthinking quality of habitual action stems from background knowledge – what actors think *from* rather than about (Hopf, 2010: 541; Pouliot, 2008: 260). Habit, thus, is both *ideational* (resting on assumed knowledge) and *processual* (expressed in repetitive and relatively automatically engaged classes of action). What ‘counts’ as repetitious may be debated, but the observation of what is assumed the ‘normal’ of interaction serves to highlight the core of habituated action and knowledge. Both of these elements must be uncovered, and each presents challenges.

First, knowing what is ‘inside’ the heads of actors or intersubjectively held as common sense among a group is a widely recognized challenge itself (Pouliot, 2010: 28; see also Johnston, 2001; Wendt, 2001). Second, repeated actions produced through reflection do not look any different from relatively automatic action. Observing this distinction requires an interpretivist lens to sense practitioners’ foundational and contextualized thinking (Pouliot, 2014: 243-250; see also Fujii, 2017; Schatz, 2009).

To confront taken-for-granted and naturalized knowledge requires a methodological focus on phenomenology and induction, and one that begins with understanding of the actors themselves (Hopf, 2002: 25; Pouliot, 2010: 58-59, 66). Analysis must start with actors as part of larger collectives and to recover the shared social facts held within (Hollis and Smith, 1992: 3; Pouliot, 2010: 58). This is necessarily an “imaginative act”, serving to marry inductive observation with local and historical contextualization (Geertz, 1973: 15). Further, this directs one towards the pragmatist assumption that “what
practitioners generally do, as they go on with their lives, is basically ‘what works’ in and through practice” (Adler and Pouliot, 2011: 22).

Three methods seem most apt to the recovery of habit from collectives: participant observation, in-depth qualitative interviews, and documentary and secondary source analysis. To some degree, these are ordered in preference. However their usage – for induction, interpretation, and historicization – is neither a unidirectional or linear progression, nor is it possible in all cases (see Pouliot, 2010: 65-72).

3.9.1 Observation
As both Pouliot (2010) and Hopf (2002) demonstrate, the search for the taken-for-granted must be an inductive enterprise. This may suggest the ideal as ethnographic research, likely in terms of participant observation. While Geertz (1973) famously offers illustration of this means for this investigation three immediate complications arise. First, given the historical nature of these cases – they are ‘long’ after all – direct observation across each case is simply not possible. Second, and equally as simple, most interactions are outside the view of a researcher, within closed institutional settings and as private communication. ASEAN Permanent Council meetings, for example, are private, as are the discussions within Foreign Ministries and the halls of capital buildings. Third and relatedly, even when meetings are public this may not be where the action lies, so to speak. The OAS Permanent Council and many of its subsidiary councils and working groups, for example, meet in public view. However, the ‘real’ action occurs prior to or outside public meetings. This is often through private discussion in the corridors prior to these meetings or during breaks, or over meals at restaurants and on the golf course.

---

27 To similar ends, psychologists have also relied on one-time self-reporting (see Verplaken 2010 71-72) and or the use of self-report indexes and questionnaires to recognize the frequency and automaticity of both action (e.g. Verplaken and Orbell, 2003) and thought (Verplaken et al., 2007). In IR, Mariano Bertucci (2014) has relied upon a similar indexing to explore automaticity in foreign policy making.

28 This is a common limitation for many interests in IR (Pouliot 2010, 67; 83 and 2014, 245-246). For exceptions, see Barnett (2002) and Neumann (2012). See also MacKay and Levin (2015) for commentary on this limitation and a number of means to counter it. Of course, past or private relations are not the only restriction in this regard. Jason Lyall, for example, notes the practical and ethical limitations for investigations in areas of violent conflict (2014: 204; see also Thomson 2010).

29 This is a suggestion that came from interviewees at both the OAS and ASEAN.
one of my senior ASEAN official interviewees noted, diplomacy is something “you do on
the golf course… to avoid the media glare and get a bit closer to the people you work
with.” Further, even when decisions and debate are undertaken within formalized
institutional settings it is often within private settings and prior to public meetings. For
example, while all meetings at the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC) were strictly off-limits to
me, many meetings of the OAS PC were not. Here, however, decisions are often
predetermined at the private meetings of sub-regional groupings rendering the public
forums largely scripted illustrations of previously derived consensus. This is apparent
through the simple fact that voting in these meetings is rare – the deliberations and
decision-making occur prior and privately. The same may be said for the annual Foreign
Ministers meetings of ASEAN, which has been a focal point for those studying ASEAN
regional norms.

The lesson is that observing ‘high politics’ – even at the mundane daily level of
interaction – is not easy, of course, and as each of these cases suggest much of the
interaction is simply not directly observable to a researcher. Thus while attending
meetings, social events, or even lingering in the halls and lobbies of organizations offers
some insight into diplomatic interactions, it is no by no means sufficient to elucidate
habitual knowledge and practice.

That said, all these things I did, and did purposefully with an eye to (limited) data
gathering. Following the political ethnographic-like “sensibilities” described by Schatz
(2009) and others (see also Weeden in the same volume), I endeavored to observe as
closely as possible in person and otherwise.30 During my two months at ASEC in the
summer of 2014 I was a fixture on the couches in the airy foyer, so much so that I was
allowed access without the formalities of security checks during my last few weeks.
Similar was my experience at the OAS in the fall of 2014. While offering only a limited
glimpse into diplomatic interactions, this was nonetheless of utility for two particular

30 I recognize, fully, that my efforts in this regard were limited – this was not a core component of my data
collection for the reasons outlined. Rather, reflecting on the full experience of fieldwork (during and post),
it is clear that much of my time outside the confines of formal interviews were of utility in the particular
ways outlined. This is something I have engaged with elsewhere (Glas n.d.).
reasons. First, this practice offered observation of the relationship between many of my
interviewees (particularly, at the OAS where I could see first hand interactions between
Ambassadors and Permanent Representatives that I had interviewed within and outside
formal meetings). Second, it made possible many follow-up conversations, as many
interviewees (but not all) would approach me to discuss issues that had returned to their
mind or to chat about how my research was progressing. These conversations often
reinforced observations made during interviews (described below), but also offered
access to new information. This may have been in light of the meeting she or he had just
left or had recognized me as an observer at in recent days, or it may have had more to do
simply with the change of location. It is possible that the change of context, from that of a
relatively formal interview to a more casual run-in, may compel some interviewees to
offer different or complementary information. This possibility was the product of the
‘good working relationship’ I developed with (most) interviewees.\textsuperscript{31} I credit the access
afforded to me to the particular disposition I attempted to present in my interviews – a
friendly, well-informed, and engaged demeanor. This, I found, resonated well with the
vast majority of interviewees, and a number of interviewees were enthusiastic to maintain
contact over Skype or email, a further means of data gathering.

Similarly, attending social events – such as working lunches, or a goodbye reception for
an Ambassador at the OAS and a Canada Day Celebration hosted by the embassy in
Jakarta – provided opportunity for causal and often candid off the record conversations.
These situations, once again, offered insight into relationships among interviewees and
potential for first and follow up conversations. Moreover, a more casual setting made
possible conversations with a number of practitioners who had declined a formal
interview. This was a suggestion made to me by a number of practitioners whom I did
interview. Their rationale was that while formal interviews may be challenging to arrange
with officials for a host of reasons, or with representatives from particular states (both at
ASEAN and the OAS), a number of reluctant representatives may be willing to
informally chat off the record while at social engagements, and many were. Thus, while

\textsuperscript{31} See Fujii (2014) on the importance of a good “working relationship” between interviewee and
interviewer.
observation was not central to the data collection here, even in a very limited manner it serves to complement the core method of this project, qualitative interviews.

### 3.9.2 Interviews

Given the limitations on participant observation and still seeking the nearest possible vantage point to the action of diplomatic interaction, this project relies largely upon in-depth qualitative interviews in tandem with documentary analysis.\(^{32}\) This focus distances this study from many who have observed norms at work in ASEAN and beyond (e.g. Acharya, 2009; 2014). Much of the scholarship on regional norms and cooperative relations, deduce norms and the bounds of appropriate conduct from the proclamations of leaders and official declarations. In his work on African regionalism, for example, Williams explores only official statements to unearth a common African Union security culture (2007: 258). Similarly, Acharya (2014) relies largely on documentary sources and official proclamations to uncover the norms of the ASEAN way of regional integration. This sort of textual investigation is certainly useful to elucidating codified and actively referenced norms of diplomatic relations. It therefore matches the interest of much of the existing literature. However, it is ill suited for the recovery of the ideational and practical aspects of regional relations (see Checkel, 2014a: 6; Jacobs, 2014: 45-46). Scripted rhetoric and official releases may not reflect the genuine beliefs (to say nothing of the practice) of diplomatic practitioners for a host of reasons (see Bennett and Checkel, 2014: 33). Better suited are in-depth qualitative interviews.\(^{33}\)

As Pouliot suggests, this “may take the researcher some distance in the recovery of practical perspectives and subjective meanings. But because such conversations mostly verbalize reflexive knowledge, background dispositions must be read between the lines and distilled from the analysis of practices” (2008: 285). Similarly, Weiner suggests that

---

\(^{32}\) Following Pouliot, the aim of such interviews is to “(imperfectly) make up for the impossibility of participant observation” (2010, 70). Hopf (2011) is dismissive of this, admittedly, second-best means to recover habits. However, he does not attend to its rationale nor the assumed benefit that can be derived from it by a reflexive researcher in any nuanced manner. I follow the logic here of Pouliot (2010), Schatz (2009) and others, aware of the limitations.

\(^{33}\) There are, of course, complications with data derived from interviews as well. For example, Fujii (2010) explores the reality that only “shades of truth” may be derived from interviews. This is a lesson that extends beyond her thematic focus. Reflexivity, then, on the part of the researcher is a necessity (see Glas, n.d.; Barnett and Checkel 2014, 24-25; Fujii 2017; Fujii 2012).
“even if we know the words and speak the same language, a word in and by itself provides insufficient information about its meaning” (2009: 178). The central aim of the interviews undertaken for this project, then, was to generate lines to read between and to establish an imperfect understanding of “the world from the subjects’ point of view, to unfold the meaning of people’s experiences, [and] to uncover their lived world to scientific explanations” (Kvale 1996, 1 quoted in Pouliot 2010, 68).

These starting assumptions lead to two central interests in my interviews. First, interviews aim to explore what practitioners know and how they know it – to gleam insights into the assumptions and dispositions of regional relations. Second, they aim to extend this focus in what is done – the habituated practices that are produced relatively unreflexively therefrom. These are those mundane and everyday aspects of inter-state relations that make up the lauded “ASEAN way” (Acharya, 2014) or the South American “diplomatic culture” (Holsti, 1996) in practice. The aim of such interviews, then, is the generation of situational and dispositional insider knowledge and the recovery, as faithfully as possible, of the habitually engaged practices of diplomatic interaction.

Further, the goal of these interviews was less to derive a personal account from a number of individual practitioners, but rather an account of the collective dispositional knowledge and practical habits of a community of practitioners. To access this type of ‘data’ one cannot simply ask interviewees of their routines, habits, or underlying thinking. As Adam Watson, among many others, recognizes, “It is notoriously difficult for a member of a society to describe it because it is impossible to distance oneself far enough from it” (1992: 299; see also Jepperson and Swidler, 1994). Rather, the central interest in these interviews was to allow for a particular type of conversation, and one that would make possible the recovery of habitual and practical aspects of regional relations.

---

34 On the means to recover such collective understandings see Fujii (forthcoming), Pouliot (2010: 71), and Coronil and Skurski (1991: 318). An understanding of the collective quality of identity and practice is supported as well by existing constructivist accounts, many of which suggest it a necessary condition for multilateralism (e.g. Katzenstein, 1996: 22; Hemmer and Katzenstein, 2002).
To this end, one may start with the cognitive aspects of regional practitioners themselves – to deduce what they think about, what they from, and what they assume as normal, unproblematic categories for action. Following Hopf’s suggestions, one can attempt to recover “structured discourses of identity that imply… kinds of habitual categorizations” (2010, 551). Similarly, in the view of Bueger and Gadinger, this is an attempt to illuminate “representations of practice that have to be carefully interpreted” (2015: 457). Following both suggestions, the aim is to derive a particular type of “narrative data” or stories from interviews that can be reflected upon. As Fujii describes,

> The value of these stories lies in the causal logics, worldviews, cosmologies, values, feelings, and shared understandings they reveal. Through the stories they tell, people locate themselves as agents in the various social worlds they identify with, aspire to, imagine, or inhabit. People’s stories provide insight into why they think certain events happened one way and not another (2017: 3).  

To access this data, interviews must be well planned but dynamic. While I did not follow a common questionnaire for all interviews – each semi-structured interview was designed for the particular interviewee based on their background and the information derived as interviews progressed – each attempted to unearth background knowledge and to produce a description of activities (see Nicolini 2009). With this interest in mind I attempted to follow Pouliot’s suggestions (2010, 68-69) and to ask, (1) questions that address daily practice and solicit description; (2) questions that address a practitioner’s view of the practices of others over their own; (3) questions that destabilized practitioners’ assumptions and forced reflection; and (4) questions that proposed hypothetical scenarios.

At the onset of an interview I began with questions about recent practice – the most pressing issues of the embassy or permanent mission or secretarial department. These questions attempted to solicit description of daily practice and, in particular, the practice of others. These were tailored to the interviewee. I often attempted to solicit a broader range of practices – in the South American interviews, for example, I often asked if these daily priorities and experiences were the same at other institutions or organizations that interviewee was familiar with. Do their colleagues in other missions or embassies have

---

35 See also Pouliot on “narrative causality” (2010: 64).
the same views in their opinion? These sorts of questions attempted to recover the lived experience of the particular interviewee, but also probe for how far the interviewee assumed it travelled to others’ experience. Given the two research sites, this approach lead to a particular variation in the data as explored in the empirical chapters that follow. By starting with what and how particular practitioners did and do, conversations necessarily reflect organizational realities as a proxy for regional ones. Interviews at ASEAN suggest congruence between levels; ASEAN is in large part the region and it is the locus of regional relations. Indeed, as Chapter 4 explores, regional practitioners working at and around the ASEC think about relations among the ten member states, and the illustrations and explorations they provided in interviews speak largely. At the OAS, however, daily work sees South American regional state practitioners engaged with the wider Pan-American membership of the organization. Thus, the illustrations and explorations that South American practitioners chose to provide to explore their priorities, concerns, and daily activities, extend beyond intra-regional relations with South American states. In some ways this is a limitation, as it unearths less direct intra-regional reflection than did the set of ASEAN interviews. However, it also serves to more quickly illustrate the distinctiveness of South American thinking and practice, as consistently South American practitioners contrasted their behaviour, interests, and thinking with that of their extra-regional partners.

From questions about daily priorities and activities, I moved into more substantive content, asking why things were done the way they were, as means to cause reflection on assumed knowledge. Often I was given scripted responses. Among ASEAN practitioners, for example, there was frequent reference to the ‘ASEAN way,’ although the make-up of this amorphous set of norms changed across interviewee – something itself suggestive that a single, coherent set of established norms of appropriate behaviour may not be as consequential as many scholars may attest. Generally, I would listen for quite some time to a rehearsed exposition of what the interview thought about the issue, only to interrupt after a few minutes (or more) and offer a question or piece of information that thoroughly destabilized the interviewee’s thinking – and often readjusted their view of me as an interviewer. I would raise rumors I had heard from other sources or details of private
meetings that the interviewee was surprised I was privy to. This knowledge stemmed from secondary literature and documentary sources, but most importantly from previous interviews. On a number of occasions an interviewee who had not previously requested anonymity at this point requested anonymity before continuing – a sign that deeper, more candid recollections were on the way. During my ASEAN interviews, for example, I would raise particulars of the failed 2012 Leaders’ Summit Joint Communiqué, Indonesia’s response to the 2008 Nargis Cyclone, or the limited debate around an common ASEAN statement in reaction to 2014 Russian annexation of Crimea (episodes discussed in Chapter 4). Raising substantive issues that an interviewee felt were not so public was one means of gaining a more candid response. Further, this served, in part, to shift from what an interviewee was thinking about to unearth what she was thinking from. Rather than actively reflecting on a scripted rhetoric of ‘safe’ discourse, interviewees shifted to their own experiences, often less encumbered by the buzzwords of official rhetoric. To more fully destabilize take-for-granted assumptions, however, I would also often allow an interviewee to respond at length with their thinking on an issue (e.g. the rationale for ASEAN’s limited response to China’s territorial claims in the South China Sea), only to punctuate it with a question that would trouble this line of thinking (e.g. a European practitioners’ critique of this policy as not inevitable and inherently problematic). This would cause reflection not only on assumptions deeply engrained in the practitioners thinking, but reassessment of statements she just made. Finally, I would attempt to bring further into relief the assumed knowledge and habitual practices by proposing hypothetical scenarios – ‘what if’ questions – based on our discussion during the interview. Through these means, interviews attempted to reach the unproblematic assumptions communities of practitioners think from and the practices that derive habitually therefrom.

Interview Location

Turning to the data itself, in the summer and fall of 2014 I undertook a series of interviews with practitioners at the ASEAN Secretariat and the OAS Secretariat and their respective embassies and permanent missions over four months. These locations were selected for three central reasons.
First, they represent core multilateral institutions of each region concerned with political and security matters (as well as economic). Southeast Asia is a region defined by ascent to ASEAN, and South America is a region with a multitude of regional organizations but few pan-regional institutions and none with such long history and diverse a focus (politically, economically, socially) as the OAS. However, at first thought perhaps, this pan-hemispheric organization may seem a puzzling site to explore the practical norms of South American diplomacy. OAS membership includes not only the twelve states of South America, but also the Caribbean, Central America, and North America.

Two interests informed this choice.

First, South America is puzzling devoid of the organizational density and permanence of other regions – chiefly Europe, of course, but also the region-defining and permanent organization as in ASEAN. While the Americas are home to the longest lasting organization, the OAS, and South American history demonstrates myriad of attempts at both Pan and South-American unity, many are episodic. The Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) and its secretariat in Quito, Ecuador was a candidate for this investigation, but given its relative novelty (entering into force only in 2011, its Secretariat under construction in 2014) and the lack of extra-regional engagement directly with it, the OAS was privileged. Second, the OAS offers an opportunity to ‘see’ state and regional identities and to place them into stark relief. Within this setting, it is possible to glimpse the self-evident sense of normal diplomatic practice for particular state practitioners (e.g. South American state representatives) and contrast that with the self-evident sense of normal according to other state practitioners working closely with them (e.g. US and Canadian representatives or OAS Secretariat officials). Further, the limits and bounds of a community of practitioners with this shared sense of self-evident normality can be intuited from contrasting discussions of normalcy, but also from more explicit references made by practitioners themselves. As Acharya observes in the case of ASEAN, through this means one can observe the “commonly held notions about who is

36 To address this interest, however, I spoke with a number of practitioners (9 of 22 interviewees) explicitly regarding UNASUR, many of which had direct working experience within the organization.
included and who is excluded” from a community of practitioners (2014: 25). The same can be recovered from engaging with practitioners at the OAS, and it provides particularly useful context in which to view such dynamics, conscious of the limitation noted above. Further, interviewing extra-regional officials within this Pan-American organization affords a useful control not required of the Southeast Asian case, where state membership to the organization is also membership to the region itself. This two-level attention allows the differentiation on what may be understood as ‘organizational culture’ (e.g. Nelson and Weaver, 2014), from the regional habits of interest to this study. Thus, while the OAS does not represent the locus of South American diplomacy itself, it does offer insight into the practices and thinking of practitioners from across the region and its organizations. Similarly, while ASEAN does indeed represent the locus of diplomacy in the region, the research conducted here used it merely as a hub from which to explore relations beyond the confines of the ASEC. In this way, the habits and dispositions uncovered through interviews at each location are assumed to expand beyond the confines of the organizational architecture – they are not organizational, but rather regional habitual dispositions.

Second, and pragmatically, these locations afford a researcher an aggregation of regional practitioners. Each is host to embassies and permanent missions from all regional states of interest and diplomats working from each location have a wealth of regional experience when they arrive. Thus, it is relatively easy to access interviewees efficiently, and these interviewees can speak to a range of regional issues. Third, each location affords the researcher access to a pool of practitioners from beyond the region of interest that interact daily with regional practitioners. ASEAN has nine Dialogue Partner states with ambassadors and staff keenly engaged with the ten Southeast Asian states, and the OAS has the other twenty-two states of the hemisphere represented – most importantly for me, the United States and Canada – in continued relations with the twelve South American states. These practitioners external to the region, as ‘others’ who continually engage with regional practitioners offer an essential glimpse into regional habits.
Interview Participants

In Jakarta, I spoke formally with 41 practitioners and scholars engaged directly with ASEAN, and had more than a dozen informal and off-the-record conversations. In Washington, I interviewed 23 practitioners at the OAS, most of whom not only had practical and lengthy experience there but other regional forums such as Mercusor and UNASUR. This was a purposeful interest and discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.\(^{37}\) I also spoke with a small number of scholars in Washington, both formally and informally.

To build into a larger comparative context in Chapter 6, I also interviewed 24 African Union practitioners at the AU Commission in Addis Ababa. This set of interviews is explored in greater detail in that chapter. At each of these locations interviews were supplemented and expanded upon by a number of follow up conversations outside the confines of formal interviews and in subsequent phone, Skype, or email correspondence, always at the suggestion of the interviewee or through more casual run-ins within the organization or at social events, as described above.\(^{38}\)

Interviewees included Foreign Ministers, Ambassadors and Permanent Representatives, senior diplomatic staff, and prominent individuals working within security and political...

\(^{37}\) A number of conversations at each of these locations offered insights into the habits of the others, as practitioners often had experience across these regional forums. For example, a number of OAS practitioners had worked with ASEAN in the past and had their own and contrasting insights into the procedures and practice across the Pacific.

\(^{38}\) My interviews in Jakarta varied in their settings. A number of ASEAN interviewees (15/41 interviewees) requested interviews outside of their workplace. Most of these suggested meeting in a Starbucks in one of the many and massive malls Jakarta offers, while four suggested that we meet over a meal (one Ambassador at his home for breakfast, two American officials out for hamburgers, and one ASEAC official for dinner at a very loud Chinese restaurant). Generally, senior officials requested meetings in their offices, while lower-level officials requested meeting outside of the workday and often far from their place of work. Understandably, they may have less freedom with their workday and perhaps worry more about being spotted speaking to a researcher by colleagues. These non-office setting meetings offered a number of benefits and a few restrictions as well. They often ran longer than those during the workday and in formal settings. In general, ASEAN interviews were much longer than one hour (my requested time commitment), less formal in tone, and with considerable informal discussion on a range of personal and professional issues after the conclusion of the formal interview component. Most interviews with ASEAN practitioners lasted at least 1.5 hours to two, and a smaller number more than three. At the OAS none of the interviewees requested a meeting outside of their office or the lounge of the OAS Main Building, and all limited their time in ways I was not accustomed to at ASEAN. Few went beyond the hour I requested, although many were available for follow-up meetings. My interviews at ASEAN generally ended when the conversation did, rather than when our allotted time expired. Rare was the meeting that was cut short by a secretary or a glance at a watch. At the OAS, most of my interviews, concluded precisely at the scheduled end point (often with a secretary announcing the arrival of the interviewee’s next appointment). What these differences say – about the organizations, about the interviewees, about the organizational culture, about the data the interviews yield – is something I explore elsewhere (Glas n.d.).
issues in each Secretariat, many at the deputy-secretary general or director level. Similar investigations often focus on conversations with such high-ranking diplomatic officials (and states) with the “loudest voice” (Pouliot, 2010: 84). This was my impulse as well. However, I was eager to speak with anyone I could in both locations, and snowballing necessitates this openness. Somewhat to my surprise, I found that interviews with lower level diplomatic staff (embassy ‘secretaries’ or technical officers, for example) often provided exceptional insight into diplomatic practice. This is for two reasons.

First, these individuals often have an excellent vantage point to glimpse relations I could not be privy too. Working as advisors, note-takers, or assistants during closed-door meetings, these individuals were in a privileged position and could share views that I could not glimpse directly. Further, and often as a result of their professional interest in advancement, told me that they actively survey the diplomatic “action” and record it mentally for reasons outside, but aligning with, my interest. While this is not an ideal view of the knowledge that undergirds diplomatic practices, it does afford a particularly useful subjective lens from which to view practice in action. Second, I often found these individuals willing to pass along (anonymously, whether they wished it or not) rumors or privy information that their superiors often were less willing to address. For this, I credit my general disposition and perhaps my similarities in age that may have afforded me this access (many more junior diplomatic officials appeared to be in their late 20s or early 30s, my age during interviews as well). This provided necessarily privileged details to gain access to candid thoughts and stories by their superiors in later interviews.

I could not gain access to representatives or practitioners from all the states I was interested in, however. At the OAS my focus was the twelve South American state embassies and their Permanent Representatives to the OAS. My reasoning here was that the senior officials would have the wealth of professional experience – and likely from beyond the current organizational setting – I was keen to capture. I was able to gain formal interviews with representatives or practitioners at nine of twelve states. The three I
was unable to speak with were Venezuela, Bolivia and Uruguay, largely as a result of the apparent disinterest of embassy staff and officials. My identity, as a Canadian, likely did me no favours there.\textsuperscript{40} I supplemented this set of South American interviews with OAS officials and interviews with Canadian and American OAS diplomats. With ASEAN, my interest was largely with the Permanent Representatives and senior ASEC officials. I interviewed three of ten ASEAN member state Permanent Representatives directly, various officials from five member state ASEAN missions, and ASEC officials with prior to current experience at the directorate or Deputy Secretary-General level in seven of nine ASEC directorates, across all four pillars, with a focus on the Political Security Community pillar of the Secretariat and emergent Community.\textsuperscript{41} I also spoke with a number of Indonesian government and Foreign Ministerial officials, including ex-Foreign Minister Dr. Hassan Wirajuda. As a proxy for access that was not easily forthcoming, I attempted to focus some of my questions of officials on their retelling of the practices of certain states. For example, I found it difficult to speak formally or at length with a Myanmar official at ASEAN I had hoped to interview. I also found it challenging to speak at all with any Venezuelan officials at the OAS (a state actor, who as central to the ALBA countries, has a ‘loud voice’ at the OAS even when silent). Both of these states became recurrent topics I asked other interviewees directly about. The aim was to at least recover a semblance of the interests, thinking, and practices of these states whose officials I was not able to directly or formally engage.

At each location formal interviews were supplemented with other less formal conversations that provided insight. These were not counted as formal interviews, of course, but offered useful insights of their own and often buttressed the rumors and ‘insider’ information that could be used strategically in formal interviews or as points of data to help with the interpretation of statements from formal interviews. These included meeting officials from ASEAN member states that I was unable to interview formally (often by request and often by disinterest) for confidential conversations they wished to

\textsuperscript{40} Issues of positionality and power during some of these interviews are explored in Glas and Soedirgo (n.d.).

\textsuperscript{41} I phrase this in this purposefully vague manner to maintain anonymity of senior staff and representatives. Given the relatively small number of representatives and senior ASEC officials, providing details may compromise that principle.
remain that way, or very casual conversations with ASEC officials. I also had a number of short and casual conversations with OAS officials, journalists and scholars, at a number of formal or informal events, as noted above.

Further, I sought to gain insights from non-regional practitioners who worked with regional states. This was essential to my research design, as explored below. My interest here was with those states with consistent engagement within the regional organizations. For South America, this meant Canada and the US in particular, and for ASEAN various Dialogue Partners including the United States, Australia, and the European Union. I conducted a series of formal interviews with these non-regional practitioners at each organization as well as number of non-interview conversations off the formal record that further informed my thinking. As explored below, contrasting what is assumed as given and natural by a community of practitioners (e.g. ASEAN member state diplomats and staff) with a group of practitioners who engage this community as external others (e.g. ASEAN Dialogue Partners) serves to further bring into relief the distinctive and habitual aspects of community practices.42 This also serves as one means to falsify the inherent assumption that the habitual qualities of diplomacy of one community are distinct. Comparing and contrasting the sense of ‘normal’ diplomatic practice is a first step in demonstrating this distinctiveness. Further, particularly at the OAS, this duel-level of interviewing serves another function. This helps distinguish a set of regional habits and dispositions from a potential organizational culture shared by practitioners of and beyond the region (Nelson and Weaver, 2014). For example, if a number of Canadian and American OAS officials suggest distinctions between their South American and their Caribbean colleagues, this serves to further reinforce faith that what is being observed is a South American habitual disposition rather than one that is shared by OAS practitioners more generally. Thus, the practices and thinking investigated is not limited to the organizations’ own “rules, rituals, and beliefs” (Barnett and Finnemore, 1999: 710). I

42 Following Pouliot (2014), this is one way to address, at least in part, what Stephen Turner (2004) has described as the “Mauss problem.” To recognize a habituated practice it must be “both native and alien to a researcher’s own system of meanings” – yet if too alien it may be impossible to fully understand and too if native imperceptible (Pouliot, 2014: 244).
aimed, therefore, to interview both regional practitioners and a number of non-regional practitioners who work closely with the regional states.

I recognize that this sampling is not exhaustive. Nor is it random. However, I believe it to be largely representative of those within the field of interest and the state actors within each regional context with a useful focus on particular political and security practitioners I was most interested in, as well as of key external ‘others’ capable of offering insight into regional interactions. Further, it allows sufficient insight into the habitual disposition of the regional practitioners through both their own narratives and by contrasting one assumed “normal way diplomacy works,” as one interviewee termed it, with alternatives from an external group in consistent interaction with the practitioners I was most interested in.

I also recognize that conclusions drawn from this sample and extrapolated beyond are necessarily limited (i.e. George and Bennett, 2005: 233). I follow Hopf, among others, and recognize that “Interpretivism is committed the principle that additional evidence is always available and that its presence can affect the meaning of whatever has already been assembled. As a result, we can never assert confidence claims to validity, except within the narrow confines of the evidence we have already assessed” (2002, 29). However, as Barnett and Checkel (2014: 27-28) and Pouliot (2010: 85) suggest, once data (regarding knowledge and practice) becomes repetitious, as it was at each location, one may assume a relative saturation and thus suggest that the assembled and interpreted meaning can travel within certain bounds (see also Hayes, 2013: 44). The limits of this travel are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 in reference to each regional case.

3.9.3 Texts

Approaching the dispositional qualities of inter-state relations in these cases, particularly given the time scale, precludes the possibility of relying solely on interviews. Moreover, the interest to do so is not there. The inductive interpretation that stems from such an

---

43 Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
approach provides the necessary step and one that founds the bulk of the discussion in
Chapters 4 and 5, but it is not the only means relied upon here to pursue the dispositional
qualities of practitioners and the underlying habits, routines and taken-for-granted
knowledge that make up what actors think from. As Pouliot describes,

While inductive interpretation is necessary for recovering subjective meanings and
practical logics, contextual and historical interpretation is required for their
objectification in a larger context of intersubjectivity, social relations, and patterns of
domination. This subjective-with-an-o methodology aims at overcoming the
epistemological duality of subjectivism and objectivism by restoring the practical logic of
social life and casting it under the analytical light of its intersubjective context and
history (2010, 64).

To this end, I turn to the study of various texts, particularly a number of speeches,
agreements, treaties, and joint communiqués from each region. The aim in studying these
kinds of documents is three-fold. First, they provide the necessary stock of background
information for my own need in planning interviews and seeking a preliminary glimpse
into regional relations. However the iterated norms and principles enshrined in such
official texts quickly proved – from my own external view – at odds with much of the
discussion had in interviews themselves. Nonetheless, they were a useful first step in
designing research questions and familiarizing myself with the regions and the
organizations I visited. Second, and similar in aim to the interpretivist interviews, it
allows some imperfect insight into the assumptions of regional practitioners
themselves. Third, it affords insight in the often-abstract nature of regional – and global – norms and
principles themselves (i.e. Bernstein, 2001: 30). As Pouliot articulates it, such an
approach mirrors Vaughn’s ‘historical ethnography’ and Patrick Jackson’s ‘textual
ethnography’ among others (see Pouliot, 2010: 70). Hopf (2002) aspires similar ends,

44 Fujii (2017) offers a similar justification for her relational interviewing methodology and the importance
of selection versus sampling interviewees: “In relational interviewing… there is no assumption that the
researcher will be working hypo-deductively. In fact, the assumption is that the researcher will be drawing
on both deductive and inductive logics. So instead of thinking in terms of sampling, you might think in
terms of selecting interviewees. The term “selection” emphasizes the process of identifying, locating, and
accessing interviewees where as “sampling” assumes a pre-set criteria for deciding who is or is not relevant
to the study. During the course of research, your criteria for whom you want to talk to might shift, alter,
expand, or take a new turn; the term selection is meant to capture this dynamism” (v2.0, p. 14).
through his phenomenological *intertextualized* reading of Russian texts. He relies on textual analysis to induce the collective identities and discursive formations that constituted social cognitive structures in Moscow in both 1955 and 1999 (Hopf, 2002: 23-38). Brian C. Rathbun, with a similar impulse, makes use of speeches, memoirs, diaries, and biographies to assemble the “core beliefs” of key US policy-makers in his search for evidence of generalized trust, which proceeds and undergirds institutional design (2011: 254; see also Oelsner, 2007). Adler and Pouliot hint at this as well when they note that iterated taken-for-granted practices “congeal in a variety of social things, such as institutions, objects, taboos, laws, rites, etc.” (2011: 19). Following this lesson, documentary sources, along with the extensive secondary literature on each case, were used strategically to two ends. First, they offer a first glimpse at those aspects of regional relations that may be taken for granted as habituated practices or as part of the stock of assumed knowledge. Second, they allow one to, again imperfectly, trace the existence of habits observed in 2014 into years earlier.

### 3.10 Summary

Returning to the two-part research designed noted above, this first stage of my research aims to uncover the collectively held habitual dispositions of communities of practitioners by examining, as closely as possible, what practitioners think from and assume as normal diplomatic relations in practice. The methods outlined above also allow for a degree of falsifiability in asserting the existence of habitual dispositions. Through interviews, one can assess whether conscious or instrumental reflection on the qualities of the regional habitual disposition by members of the community exist. If, during an interview, an interviewee reflects critically on how they did or hypothetically would respond to a regional crisis, this would serve to disconfirm the habituation of certain regional qualities of relations. For example, many ASEAN interviews suggested that a particular version of procedural consensus dominates how they approach discussions
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45 Hopf was “out of his mind” in his approach to texts – engaging them without an ambition to “test” theory or apply existing categories (2002: 26). This is more challenging with (elite) interviews – one does not easily have the ability to revisit the source and some structure is necessarily imposed due to this constraints. However, I attempted to impose only a general structure to my questions, allowing interviewees to address issues – cooperation and disagreements, critical appraisal of progress and accolades, etc. – as they saw fit without narrow impositions on the subject or language. On discourse analysis in this regard, see Hansen (2011: 73-92).
regarding regional crises. In a number of accounts it was clear that informal consensus was “the only game in town,” as one Thai diplomat phrased it, and that there was no reflection on other means of coming to agreement (e.g. attaining procedural consensus through voting during meetings).\footnote{Interview with Thai official, Jakarta July 1, 2014. As noted in Chapter 2, interviewees are generally anonymous unless otherwise noted.} In this interview and many others, there was an automaticity in language and manner of response that suggested little or no reflection on other potential processes of interaction. There was a commonly expressed sense of ‘of course’ in the language and manner in which Southeast Asian interviewees spoke about issues of consensus, like all aspects of their habitual disposition outlined in the following chapter. Absent this ‘of course’ manner apparent in the narrative data derived from interviews, the habitual quality of ASEAN consensus-seeking practices would be not be confirmed. Through interviews similar to those outlined here Hopf, too, suggests this is a key means of testing for the validity of habit at work and allowing for falsification (2010: 550-551).

In short, using the methodological tools outlined above, I can know, and I can show, that habitual dispositions exist within particular communities. This allows for the first of two comparisons that serve to bring the particulars of these regional habits into relief. Further, by contrasting the assumed “normal way diplomacy works” of each region with rival assumptions from external others, the existence of unique habits of each region are brought into better focus.

A second means of bringing the existence of regional diplomatic habits into relief is through a cross-case comparison. In the conclusion of this work (Chapter 6) I contrast the distinctive habitual disposition of Southeast Asia with South America and introduce a third case, that of the African Union to better underscore the variation in diplomatic practice posited. This serves to further bring into relief the existence of particular taken-for-granted habitual disposition of each region, and better underscore the particular practices of regional diplomacy that produce a particular type of peace in case.
Uncovering the existence of regional habitual dispositions in each case is the first of two interests however. It is to the effect of these habits that I now turn.

### 3.11 Capturing and Comparing the Effect of Habit

The second aspect of the research design is to elucidate the effects of habits of diplomatic interaction. As discrete sets of cognitive and practical qualities of diplomacy, habitual dispositions structure behaviour and have a ‘constitutive causal’ effect on long-term regional relations and peace. As hypothesized, habitual dispositions in each regional community of practitioners are likely to shape conflict management and thereby inform the long and conflictual peace of each region.

Habit is a mechanism itself in this account. This claim has precedent in the literature upon which this project builds. For, Mitzen routinization (2006a) or procedural habituation (2006b) is the core mechanism that undergirds trust in the European security community. As she suggests, “if communicative action is the ‘micro-mechanism’ of this [European] security community… it would seem that this mechanism, and the substantive promise of deliberative processes overall, rest on the procedural habituation to them. Participants must take for granted that they will be exchanging reasons again and again, in order to allow themselves to be persuaded to learn” (2006b: 278). Pouliot suggests a similar and inherent mechanism when he asserts that a security community rests on the existence of diplomacy as “the only thinkable or self-evident practice in mutual dealings” (2010: 280). Bjola and Kornprobst suggest much the same when they propose that the “enduring disposition” towards restraint, or particular “habitus of restraint,” is the glue that holds security communities together (2007: 286; 291). Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) highlight a similar mechanism in their exploration of norm dynamics more generally. Equating habits with iterated behavior, they suggest that scholars have “understood the power of these mechanisms for years but have not connected them theoretically with norms and social construction debates” (1998: 905). Habit is thus not a new mechanism to be added to a growing list that constructivists concern themselves with (see Checkel 2014b: 11), but one in need of greater analytic focus and an explication of its effect through empirical
investigations. In this way, habitual dispositions may be seen as the proximate cause of patterns of peace and conflict as they may themselves shape hope regional diplomatic actors confront and manage regional conflict. Before exploring how I unearth the effect of habits, I pause to explore how related literatures explore and observe such cause and effect.

Habit is distinct from mechanisms of socialization long recognized in the constructivist literature and beyond. The core constructivist mechanisms are persuasion and social influence (see Johnston, 2005; Zurn and Checkel, 2005: 1051-1054). Axelrod (1997), for example, suggests a number of crucial mechanisms that explain pro-norm behaviour in the absence of exogenous material (dis)iincentives (see also Johnston 2001, 495-498): the degree to which an actor identifies with the group; the legitimate authority of a norm and its sponsor; social proof or the mimicking of a valued in-group’s behaviour (see also Beyers, 2005), and voluntary membership through assumed defection costs of self-esteem (Hooghe, 2001 and Schimmelfennig, 2005). Richard Price (1998) and Checkel (e.g. 2001) have focused on social learning to this end, something that this is inherent within the security community literature as well (e.g. Adler and Barnett, 1998: 43-44). These mechanisms suggest some kind of identification within a group and the active recognition of the appropriateness of behaviour therein (see also Johnston, 2001: 495). In all, two analytic assumptions are made: actors recognize their community or group and then actively reflect or assess the content of norms, the actors with whom they are interacting, and or the assumed instrumental costs (see Johnston, 2001: 496-498 and Johnston 2005: 1034, fn41). Habit assumes the former but not the latter.

Habits spring from an intersubjective context, but they are not actively reflected upon. As Pouliot notes of practical knowledge, one should understand it “as unreflexive and inarticulate through and through” (2008: 265). The knowledge unproblematically assumed and the practices that derive therefrom are not reflected upon. Recognition of participation within an in-group or community is sufficient for habit to structure action and impact the social world. In this view, habit is thus both a semiotic and relational or practical mechanism (see Pouliot, 2014: 256). As such habit is not observable directly.
However, by following the research design outlined the “observable clues” of their work can be identified (Jacobs, 2014: 48). To this end, I offer three means:

(1) articulating habitual dispositions as particularly “robust” and thus theoretically of particular consequence;
(2) tracing habits in action within each case and falsification alongside the evaluation of rival and complementary propositions, and;
(3) contrasting different habits across cases.

I explore this three-part approach to examining the effects of habit in turn.

**3.11.1 Robust Habits: Self-Evident Competence**

Particularly consequential habits are those that are not only deeply held as natural and given, but self-evidently known as efficacious by practitioners pushed to reflect upon them. This level of habitual quality in relations is something I term “robust.” This may seem a contradiction in terms. Habits are not reflected upon, but may be assumed effective, efficient, and competent. Here, the reliance of interviews as outlined above is the core methodological tool. In a common formulation from my interviews, practitioners often assume that there is a particular “normal way diplomacy works” and find it unfathomable to think of distinct practices to be possible or efficacious. In this and many accounts I uncovered through detailed interviews, there exists a normal practice that is self-evident to different communities of practitioners. Further, through interviews it is clear that different communities of practice find it odd to face questions that ask them to consider alternative ways. In most cases this is because individual officials within distinct communities of practice assume that the “normal way diplomacy works” therein makes possible a perceived level of peace and cooperation. In short, interviews across different communities of practitioners unearth common assumptions that distinct and unproblematically given means of interaction are normatively ‘good’ in and for their respective region. In interviews with practitioners from both regions, for example, there
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47 Barnett and Checkel remind us that all mechanisms are at some level unobservable (2014: 11-13). We cannot, of course, see the real-time brain waves of social actors nor brain activity of the past. They argue that while, in principle, explanations must have congruence with the finest level of detail in practice even macro-level mechanisms may be posited and observed in particular ways.

48 Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
were confident assertions that their style of diplomacy – and the habitual qualities they themselves could not easily recognize as distinctive or as a potential choice – rendered their regions uniquely peaceful. As one Chilean official confidently suggested, “in South America we resolve conflicts in a peaceful and negotiated way, more than Europe, more than Africa and even more than in East Asia too.” Practitioners in Southeast Asia mirrored this suggestion explicitly as well, as explored in more detail in Chapter 6.

Three assumptions are made in this common formulation of “robust” habits, and each is directly observable through the method of interpretivist interviews as described above: (1) a set of diplomatic normal practices exists as self-evident; (2) it is similarly self-evident that these practices produce ‘good’ regional relations, even if practitioners cannot articulate how or why that is the case, and; (3) that these regional relations are, in practice, optimal and thus do not dictate any need to problematize the previous two assumptions. Through this formulation it is also clear that a self-evident assumption of competence of the practice is inherent. Practitioners who engage in robust habits know that practices are effective vis-à-vis some intersubjective standard of efficacy and legitimacy and the interview methods, as outlined, make possible this insight. As outlined above, interview questions were designed to assess whether practitioners commonly thought from assumptions as to particular means to respond to crises and in so doing, they also unearthed that practitioners assumed these practices efficacious. In short, through the narrative data derived from interviews, can see that various regional communities of practitioners assumed their own, particular brand of diplomacy as not only the ‘only game in town’ but one that inherently ‘works’ for their region. This reality is explored in the empirical chapters that follow.

This is a preliminary means to articulate the potential effect of habit by demonstrating the robustness of regional diplomatic habits. Thus the first step in directly observing the effect of habit is to elucidate the assumptions of practitioners and then destabilize their taken-for-granted thinking through interviews. If practitioners not only allude to their habitual dispositions through their description of daily practices and their responses to
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49 Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
crises, but upon destabilizing those assumptions – by questioning their effectiveness directly or raising critiques from observers or other extra-regional practitioners as means to do so indirectly - practitioners continue to believe them to be efficacious, there is reason to suspect they are of particular consequence for structuring relations. In short, the logic here is that if practitioners assume there to be a particular way diplomacy works and defend it as effective in the face of critique, then the described practices may indeed exist and with effect. In this case, pacific diplomatic habits that are self-evident to practitioners – known, inherently to ‘work’ – may be indeed ‘work’. However, again, this is a preliminary suggestion. By elucidating the robustness of the habitual disposition and then observing it in action the consequence of habit can be better articulated for each case.

3.11.2 Habit in Action: Case within Case Illustrations

Second, I seek to expose the effect of habitual disposition through an illustrative case within each regional case. By exploring a within-case illustration of habit in action practitioners’ responses can be studied for evidence of enacting their “normal way diplomacy” works and to posit habit as a mechanism at work in the production of patterns of peace. “Crises” are a useful vantage point for this study. As Glenn Snyder and Paul Diesing suggest, “it is useful to conceive of a crisis as an intermediate zone between peace and war” (1977: 10). When crisis interrupts an otherwise stable set of practices, then, this intermediate zone can be glimpsed to see if and what habits of regional relations exist and with what effect. Richard Lebow suggests a similar logic in regards to recovering constitutive causality more generally: “we must work back from behaviour to understandings and goals and show they in turn were the product of particular identities of cognitive frames” (2009: 217). Borrowing his language, the ‘cognitive frame’ of interest here is the habitual disposition of a community of practitioners. The observable implications of habit in this regard are made possible by applying the discrete qualities of the habitual disposition outlined in the first step to the case of regional crisis. Speaking to practitioners involved in the regional response to crisis and/or exploring the historical

50 See Bennett and Checkel (2014: 8) for a discussion of within-case evidence, the logic of which is relied upon here.
record, can shed light on what the interests and behaviours of regional practitioners were during the crisis. In so doing, moreover, this allows the exploration of rival or complementary claims, as articulated in Chapter 2. In particular, power in relations and the role of regional culture or norms of appropriateness can be assessed in this light.

The rationale for this method also borrows from particular view of process tracing. While the term is often ill-defined and amorphous, recent accounts define process tracing as “the analysis of evidence on processes, sequences, and conjunctures of events within a case for the purposes of either developing or testing hypotheses about causal mechanisms that might causally explain the case. Put another way, the deductive theory-testing side of process tracing examines the observable implications of hypothesized causal mechanisms within a case to test whether a theory on these mechanisms explains the case” (Bennett and Checkel, 2014: 7-8; see also Pouliot, 2010: 76-77). With an understanding of mechanisms as constitutive rather than strictly causal, and their existence as limited to the constructs of researchers rather than in an assumed objective reality, a particular understanding of habituation and its effect on regional relations may be parsed out from the historical record.51

Further, and inherently, this focus within the case allows the falsification of the habitual mechanism to be explored. As noted above, conscious or instrumental reflection on the aspects of regional habitual disposition by members of the community would serve to disconfirm its existence as such. Each within-case case, then, probes for this potential as well. Each case illustration assumes a number of things as a starting point, whether reliant on historical or interview date or both. First, we would expect to see the dispositional traits as collectively held and inherent in each case. This is straightforward in the ASEAN case, as speaking with ASEAN practitioners about their rationale and behaviour during the crisis is a means to get at this level of detail, while in the South American case inference is used to explore public statements or those recovered from others’ interview

51 On constitutive causation and the mechanisms inherent therein see Lebow (2009). In an understanding in line with the interest in proximate rather than ultimate causes here, he suggests such an approach to constitutive causation that uncovers at most necessary but not sufficient conditions, and at the weaker end possible and insufficient conditions.
data. Using the interpretivist lens outlined and focusing on practitioners and documentary evidence is means to ‘get at’ this level of data and to recover the background on which habitual practice rests in each within-case case. Second, we would expect to see this assumed set of knowledge to be applied unproblematically during the crisis. We would expect to see practitioners unreflexively enacting the practices that are assumed natural and unproblematic as a result of their shared cognitive background.

This approach is most straightforward in my exploration of the regional response to a particularly violent and recent case of inter-state militarized dispute in Southeast Asia: the 2011 Preah Vihear conflict. This case is series of violent militarized inter-state disputes between Cambodia and Thailand that saw sustained use of heavy weapons and led to the displacement of some 100,000 people. This was not only the most severe intra-regional conflict in recent decades, but it also risked escalation to all out intra-ASEAN war, while at the same time, and puzzlingly, the Association was deepening its regional Community integration efforts. I suggest that the habitual disposition of Southeast Asian diplomacy both made possible this puzzle, and was itself of deflationary, limiting the escalation of this violent conflict by a natural recourse to informal dialogue and mediation rather than formal resolution. To demonstrate this claim, I trace the diplomatic habits at work during this crisis by examining secondary sources and interviews with many officials directly involved in crafting the regional response and managing this regional conflict. In this way, the within-case case illustrates the Southeast Asian habitual disposition as a proximate cause of wider patterns of conflict management and conflictual peace.

Similarly, in the case of South America I investigate the 160-year long border dispute between Peru and Ecuador. As outlined in Chapter 5, this is a particularly important regional conflict, comprised of dozens of militarized disputes and one that demonstrates the particularities of regional solutions to regional crises. Here, however, I rely on secondary accounts of decades-long violence, and investigate the most recent, 1995, flare in violence and regional response. Once again, exploring the role the habitual disposition played in the management of the conflict after the 1995 violence serves to illustrate a
proximate cause of wider patterns of conflict management and long, conflictual peace in this region.

In both of these case-within-case illustrations, I demonstrate the deflationary effect of particular habits of regional cooperation. However, each also suggests that these habits may have prolonging impact on violence. This is particularly clear in the case of Southeast Asia’s informal habits of regional conflict management. While habits may mute and diffuse conflict and undergird long-term regional peace absent escalation to ‘war’, they also may allow conflicts to linger unresolved, thus making possible the conflictual long peace. Thus, in each of these cases within a case I suggest that the particular habitual disposition of regional diplomacy served to structure regional relations in particular ways.

However, neither is a test of the framework developed here in a strict sense and I do not provide a counterfactual analysis (see Fearon, 1991) to demonstrate its veracity as explanation. Rather each is offered as means of illustration to showcase an instance of what how regional relations function within particular communities of conflictual long peace as outlined in Chapter 2. These within-case illustrations demonstrate what makes it possible for conflict to simmer and continue, and, more importantly, demonstrates an instance of how a community with conflictual peace actually works in practice. In so doing, they offer a more accurate image of communities of peace and reality of long, but conflictual peace.

3.11.3 Contrasting Habits and Effects

Finally, the particular habitual disposition and the particular pattern of long and conflictual peace of each region can be contrasted and compared to further illustrate their distinctiveness and effect. While not strictly paired comparisons, this dual focus allows the exploration of mechanism(s) and processes that impact long peace as a dependent variable. By articulating the particular effect of particular habits in each region, their consequence can be further illustrated and the (limited) generalizability of habitual
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52 This logic follows the benefits of cross-regional comparisons noted by Sil (2009: 29).
dispositions can be articulated. Said differently, “normal” diplomacy in any region may be distinct and bounded by the particular habitual dispositions that practitioners think from and enact unreflexively. The conclusion of this work (Chapter 6) seeks to further illustrate these contrasts and to bring the consequence of particular habitual dispositions into further relief.

To explicitly address a potential critique at the onset, it is clear that this work offers an account of close, proximate causes rather than the distal, structural, or ultimate causes for the long and conflictual peace observed in each region (Gerring 2005; 2008). The methodology and particular methodological tools outlined above allow one to explore the micro-levels of regional practice: how state officials themselves understand their world and their actions therein (i.e. Adler, 1997: 329). However, they do not generate a generalizable statement of the structural causes of peace and conflict. Aligning with this level of analysis, the explanatory aim of this investigation is to demonstrate how diplomatic habitual dispositions shape regional management of peace and conflict. In this way, and following Lebow (2009: 214), I seek to develop a layered account of particular patterns of behaviour rather than some law-like statement or truth claim. In doing so, I query primarily ‘whether’ and ‘how’ habitual dispositions impact the long-term pacific cooperation of these regions (i.e. George and Bennett, 2005: 25). As such, the aims here are limited and do not extend to a generalizable theory of regional cooperation or peace – peace is a practice and remains, surely, a heterogeneously produced one (i.e. Collier and Mahoney 1996). This focus on the habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations, however, offer one promising means to explore these cases and the proximate causes of long-term patterns of pacific regional cooperation more generally.

3.12 Conclusion

This chapter has advanced the core theoretical claims of this work and one methodology and means to investigate it. Habit, it is clear, is an important but understudied focus in IR. Much of the social world and is structured prior to reflection by agents, yet our much of our analytic toolkit in IR remains inappropriate to investigate this reality. A focus on
habitual disposition of conflict management in each region is one means to this end. It allows us to correct a theoretical oversight and explore the proximate causes of stability and continuity of particular patterns inter-state relations – including those of conflictual peace in the regions of Southeast Asia and South America.

Beyond the core theoretical claims, this chapter has also advanced the research design, methodology, and methods of this investigation. In particular, this research relies upon an interpretivist methodological sensibility and upon detailed interviews with regional practitioners as a core method. As outlined in detail, this particular interpretive and comparative methodology brings into relief the distinctiveness of disparate regional habitual dispositions through interviews with intra-regional practitioners in both Southeast Asia and South America, and with those extra-regional officials who engage with regional practices in each case. This method not only uncovers the existence of habitual depositions in each region under study – as well as a means of falsification in so doing – but it allows for the first step is exploring their effect by unearthing their robustness as I have defined it. Tracing the role of habitual dispositions within cases and contrasting them across cases offers a further means of illustrating their effects.

A focus on the habitual disposition of regional diplomacy narrows our analytical focus upon two aspects of social relations. First, it centers analytical attention on practitioners themselves, and the stock of knowledge they hold as self-evident or common sense – the particular brand of “normal” diplomacy within a particular community. Second, it suggests attention be directed to the set of practices that unproblematically and relatively axiomatically derives therefrom. This commonly assumed and ontologically prior background of thought circumscribes and thus structures relations. Habitual dispositions preclude certain actions while making others not only possible, but likely. Thereby, habitual dispositions themselves structure regional relations in particular and patterned ways. In the following two Chapters of this dissertation I apply this focus on habitual dispositions and make use of the methodology outlined to explore the conflictual peace of the two regional cases at hand.
Chapter 4.
Habits of Peace in Southeast Asia

4.1 Introduction

On October 15, 2008 the Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) came into effect. The ten member states, Cambodia, Brunei, Indonesia, Laos, the Philippines, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam, bound themselves to shared principles and norms of pacific regional relations, and six months later devised a blueprint for an ambitious regional Community to further deepen their integration. However, surrounding the progress of this regional project militarized conflict remained. In 2008 and 2011 violent clashes along the Thai-Cambodian border displaced as many as 100,000 people and saw the use of tanks, heavy artillery, and cluster munitions between these ASEAN member states (International Crisis Group, 2011). Similarly, in 2005 long running tensions between Indonesia and Malaysia gave rise to a confrontation of nine warships off the Sipadan and Ligitan islands, with Indonesian military officials claiming their intent to “crush Malaysia” (Guerin, 2005).

As Chapter 2 explored, this intra-regional violence is not rare. Rather, these are relatively common punctuation in the often-lauded long peace of the region. However, while conflict may be pervasive in the region, it rarely escalates to war. The aim of this chapter is to account for this pattern of cooperation and conflict, and of integration alongside inter-state militarized disputes. I interrogate the foundation of this long and violent regional peace by uncovering the existence and exploring effect of a Southeast Asian diplomatic habitual disposition – a set of habitual and dispositional qualities that informs regional conflict response and predisposes regional officials to a toleration of a basic level of intra-regional violence. Southeast Asian practitioners know and practice a distinctive means of conflict management and think from, rather than about certain ways of confronting and managing regional problems, and furthering their individual and collective interests.
This chapter is structured over three parts. First, I briefly re-introduce the case by surveying the history of the long conflictual regional peace here, and the organizational developments that have emerged alongside it. I then turn to the application of my habit-centered framework as a means of understanding this reality. In the second section I outline the existence of the habitual disposition of the region, paying particular attention to the relationship between regional practical habit and the norms of the region and beyond. In the third section, I explore the effects of habitual dispositions in two ways. First, I demonstrate the robustness of these habitual qualities. I argue that practitioners not only know these qualities to be self-evident, but they know them as efficacious. Put simply, they are ‘the only game in town’ and they work. I then turn to observe this habitual disposition in practice by exploring its role in regional crisis response with a focus on the 2011 Preah Vihear conflict. This was not only the most severe regional conflict in recent decades, but also risked escalation to full-scale war between ASEAN member states. I suggest that the habitual disposition of Southeast Asian diplomacy was of both a pacifying and protracting effect on the conflict and that it undergirds the wider conflictual peace of the region.

4.2 Conflictual Regional Peace in Southeast Asia

As explored in Chapter 1, region is in many ways a subjective construct – for both those within and those external to it. In Southeast Asia, it was not a given that relations among these ten states would be envisioned as exclusionary, nor that they could or should be focused within a singular and exclusive organization. When the states of the region emerged from colonial rule over the two decades after the end of WWII, regional integration was not a driving concern, and many observers noted the extreme variation in neighbouring states that was likely to stymie cooperation. D. G. E. Hall describes the region, for example, as “chaos od races and languages” and hardly the setting for interstate cooperation and integration (quoted in Acharya, 1998: 206).

The chief concern of these diverse and emergent states was the consolidation of their respective national states. Rather than uniting states, this common and core aim often led
to violence. Divisive territorial claims, most notably between Malaysia and the Philippines over Sabah and wider hostilities between Indonesia and the expansive Malaysian Federation, characterized distrust and disincentivized cooperation. As Ba observes, “the point here is that independence did not free states to cooperate so much as to make conflict each other” (2009: 45).

Of particular note are the 1958 Malaysian-supported but failed coup in northern areas of Indonesia, a series of Malaysian-Philippine disputes stemming from the contested inclusion of the British colony, Sabah, in the emergent Malaysian Federation, and the hostilities between Indonesia and this newly established federation (see Amer 1998). The formation of the Malaysian Federation in 1963 and the short-lived (1963-65) inclusion of Singapore therein was the starkest cause for conflict in this period. Indonesia’s response was a three-year policy of opposition, the Confrontasi, aimed at dismantling the federation it viewed as a “colonialist conspiracy” (Kivimaki 2001: 9; Rattasenvee 2014: 115). However, while conflict characterized the region in the early 1960s, this was also the period when the particularities of regional ideas akin to its current manifestation began to grow.

Regional elites sought to temper emergent inter-state conflicts in order to focus on intra-state concerns. In 1961 Malaysia proposed the Association of Southeast Asia (ASA), a short-lived forerunner to ASEAN. The ASA was envisioned as pan-regional, inclusive of all ten ASEAN member states and thereby non-exclusive in terms of ethnicity and, unlike the US-led Southeast Asian Treaty Organization, not an anti-communist institution. However, non-aligned regional states, chiefly Indonesia, remained skeptical of the organization’s Anglo-American sympathies and fearful of its potential to infringe on the independence of regional states, and Malay-Philippines disputes over Sabah limited its effects (see Smith, 1999: 240). In 1963, the pan-Malay Maphilindo organization was formed by Malaya, the Philippines and Indonesia but it too succumbed quickly to intra-regional divisions. Malayan interests in a wider Malayan Federation, inclusive of North Borneo and Singapore, were at odds with Pilipino and Indonesian interests in limiting growing Malaysian power, and the organization was itself fatally flawed as each assumed
their goal could be realized within it (see Ba, 2009: 46-47). While these were the most established, other and distinct regional ideas were also flirted with. In the late 1950s and 1960s, some elites aspired to either wider ‘Asian’ institutions for cooperation, or more narrow intra-regional unions. Policy elites in Burma, for example, envisioned a unified Asian federation from India to Southeast Asia to China, a number of Thai politicians envisioned a union of Buddhist Mekong states, and various proposals were advanced for pan-Malay unions between Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines, Borneo, and New Guinea, as well as parts of Southern Thailand (see Ba, 2009: 44-45). While many elites flirted with wider regional organizational means to pursue national interests, these were limited in effort and were defined along distinct lines from the regional bounds that are largely taken for granted today.

Following on the organizational impulse of the ASA in 1967 five states, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, came together to form ASEAN. That this regional and organizational impulse manifested in a lasting organization does not suggest disparate interests dissipated. Moreover, many external observers viewed this new organization as likely to be another short lived and internally inconsistent manifestation of elite interests. Indeed, in this view, the region remained too socially and politically diverse, its lingering territorial disputes too divisive, and its member states too weak, ineffectual and inward looking for a regional organizational to be of consequence (see Ba, 2009: 43).53

This cooperative endeavour was made possible by shifting regional dynamics, alongside a continued shared threat perceptions (see Acharya, 1998: 203-205; Amer 1998: 34-35). A change of leadership in both Indonesia and the Philippines brought the possibility of cooperation among these states, while the US war in Vietnam bolstered the growing interest in regional unity to balance against external US influence. More pressingly, however, was a shared perception of internal, domestic threats to political stability of these still nascent states. It was the threat of communist revolution in Indonesia and

53 This claim persists still, with Jones and Smith deeming ASEAN member states “imitation states” and their regional organization ineffectual almost by definition (see 2006, especially Chapter 2).
Suharto’s rise to power that adjusted elite interest in both devising a bulwark against both Chinese and US influence in Southeast Asia and in an inter-state means of maintaining national economic and political stability (see Jones and Smith, 2006: 45-47; Stubbs, 2008: 456; Ba, 2009: 49-51; Rattasenvee, 2014: 115). Collectively, regional states sought to legitimize state-led economic development and domestic political consolidation, and also ensure regional security with less reliance on external powers (Smith 1999, 240-241; Jones and Smith 2006: 46).

These core aims were pursued with signing of the ASEAN Declaration in Bangkok in August 1967 (see also Kivimaki, 2008: 434). The five founding members agreed to “to accelerate the economic growth, social progress, and cultural development in the region through joint endeavours in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to strengthen the foundation for a prosperous and peaceful community of Southeast Asian Nations” (ASEAN Declaration). The organization was founded on a particular view of regionalism, and with decidedly informal and elite-led mechanisms (see Ba, 2009: 36 and Kivimaki, 2001) for regional cooperation distinct from the European experience (see Stubbs, 2008). As Michael Leifer, observes, from its emergence the organization demonstrated “a strong disposition against any supranational tendency” (1989: 109; see also Kivimaki, 2008: 434). Rather, the organization rests on the procedural norms of informality and non-confrontation to achieve the peaceful settlement of regional disputes as well as both the maintenance of the sovereignty of its members and the neutrality of the region in the wider Cold War power struggle.

In an effort to underscore ASEAN neutrality, ASEAN member states articulated this position four years after its founding with the 1971 declaration of the Zone of Peace, Freedom, and Neutrality (ZOPFAN), which explicitly affirmed the region’s neutrality. This declaration also signaled a shift towards an explicitly political regional organization, and laid the foundations for subsequent declaration of political unity and security cooperation (see Koga 2014). Most important in this regard were those produced during the first ASEAN Submit in 1976, including the Declaration of ASEAN Concord (Bali I) and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC). The TAC, in particular, affirmed the
now codified norms of independence, non-inference, and peaceful settlement of disputes (Chapter 1 Article 2). While a bulwark of shared norms and principles was advanced throughout the 1960s and 1970s, regional conflict did not disappear.

Most prominent was the recurrent conflict between Cambodia and Thailand, which escalated to war in 1978. While neither state were yet ASEAN members, the conflict was viewed as a threat to the stability of Southeast Asia and ASEAN member states sought to respond. Member states followed Thai interests in opposing the Vietnamese action (see Smith 1999, 241-242). Beyond this wider regional conflict, the period of organizational experimentation and regional integration under ASEAN was fraught with violence between ASEAN members. As Chapter 2 explored, during this period pervasive lesser conflicts exist – and continue to – among even formal ASEAN member states. From 1946 to 2010, there were 26 militarized inter-state disputes between ASEAN members, 18 of which are level 4, or demonstrate the use of force, and eight of which are at level 3, the display of force. There are 28 intra-regional MIDs (23 of which were level 4 or higher) in the ten years prior to ASEAN’s founding (1958-1967), and 20 (14 of which were level 4 or higher) in the ten years (1968-1977) after. While the fatalities in these disputes were certainly limited, given this use of force it is misleading to assume that “there as been no conflict between ASEAN members during its existence” (Beeson, 2009: 17). Further, and again, while a number of accounts attest to a sharp and pacific shift in regional relations after the founding of ASEAN in 1967 (Acharya, 2014: 46; Ba, 2009: 48; Kivimaki, 2001: 19), there is less clear evidence when examining MIDs. Indeed, many of these recurrent conflicts remain still, including territorial disputes between Malaysia and Singapore over Pedra Branca, Indonesia and Malaysia over the Sipadan and Ligitan Islands, Indonesia and the Philippines over the Miatan Islands, Malaysia and both Indonesia and the Philippines over Sabah, and Malaysia, Vietnam, and the Philippines over the Spratly Islands (see Kivimaki, 2001: 10-11; Wain, 2013: 54-55).

54 Given that these conflicting states were not party to the TAC as they were not ASEAN members at the time, it is insincere, unhelpful and puzzling to argue, as some critics have, that “Vietnam’s actions breached ASEAN’s 1976 landmark Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC), which ostensibly up- held the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of member states as the basis of regional cooperation, peace, and stability” (Jones and Smith 2007: 151).
Thus while founding member states saw both relative economic growth, increased organizational cooperation, and a lack of war between them, throughout this period of organizational entrenchment conflict remains a feature of the region. The same is true of the 1990s, when ASEAN membership expanded. Vietnam ascended in 1995, Laos and Myanmar in 1997, and Cambodia in 1999. Established ASEAN norms were further institutionalized by the 2009 ASEAN Charter. The Charter underscored the now expanded region’s unity and aspired to three pillars of cooperation: economic, political and cultural) These three pillars formed the basics for the nascent ASEAN Community of 2015, an aspirational and still informal association of states to cooperate and integrate these across these three levels.

As even the harshest skeptics of institutionalized cooperation in the region suggest, “Given the failed cooperative ventures that preceded ASEAN, the mere fact that it survived intact for more than a decade testified to some sort of minimalist success” (Jones and Smith, 2006: 47). This success has been particular, however. In practice, ASEAN is a particular organization, and one dissimilar from theoretical conceptions of organizations as functionally-driven and the institutionalized of codified and consequentialist rules (Ba, 2014: 296). The regional experience and its regional trajectory suggests a distinct experience from that of Europe, and when measured against this experience one ripe for critique as infective (Jones and Smith, 2007; Ravenhill, 2008; Frost, 2008; Stubbs, 2008). While such assessments can seem mutually exclusive, the reality of ASEAN is that both allude to the realities of the organization.

This brief summary is meant to showcase three trends in regional history. First, this is a region of diverse states with divisive national interests that have often been expressed through regional confrontation and conflict. While nothing unique, surely, even the more recent history of regional relations underscores that a long-regional peace does not exist absent pervasive violence among these states. Second, it underscores a history of regional relations expressed through organized – if particular – means. ASEAN is the successor of two attempts at fostering international cooperation a means to facilitate economic and political development domestically, and to ensure stability and national independence
regionally. Third, however, it underscores the particularities of regional relations. War is rare. Conflict is widespread. And, in practice, institutionalized diplomacy within and beyond ASEAN has been largely informal, resting on ‘cheap talk’ and pledges over formal treaty-signing and formalized dispute settlement mechanisms (see Jones and Smith 2007; see also Ba 2009: 35-36). Regional elites have followed what ‘works’ in and through practice, a turn to particular institutional arrangements assumed efficacious. In what follows I endeavour to explore the practical, habitual, and dispositional qualities of regional relations and explore what role they play in the long and conflictual peace of the region.

4.3 Habits of Regional Relations in Southeast Asia

As explored in Chapter 3, a focus on these habituated aspects of regional diplomacy moves beyond norms of appropriate conduct and requires a particular interpretivist methodology centered on in-depth interviews with regional practitioners. As noted, Acharya suggests that there remains “considerable room for doubt” whether the much lauded norms of the ASEAN way are indeed upheld in ASEAN practice (2014: 62). Similarly, in exploring the founding norms of the regional project Ba cautions that it is “important to distinguish between ASEAN norms – or more accurately, norms between ASEAN’s founding members – and the founding members’ aspiration that those norms form the basis for a wider, all-embracing Southeast Asian community” (2005: 257).

Again, it is clear that there may well be a disconnect between the rhetorical and codified norms of regional relations and their expression in and in through practice. Indeed, this is precisely the point of the interest in this investigation, and precisely the reason why a move away from analysis of documentary sources to a recovery of the habitual, dispositional and practical logics of officials through interviews is required. As will be demonstrated, there are important differences between norms referenced in the founding

---

55 Acharya, among others, highlights a similar set of attributes as norms of ASEAN diplomacy, chiefly those principles of the 1967 Bangkok declaration (Acharya 2014: 43-68). These include the non-use of force, pacific dispute settlement, non-interference, regional autonomy and regional solutions to regional problems, rejection of multilateral military pacts, as well as a broader set of socio-cultural norms centered on informality, consultation and consensus, and organizational minimalism. However, this focus on norms stops short of a full appreciation of the practice of regional relations.
Declaration of 1967 or the Charter signed forty years later, and the habituated practices that are enacted and encountered daily as self-evident by regional practitioners. It is the latter that are most consequential for social action and thus productive of patterns of regional relations. Below I first briefly survey the logic of the origins of habitual disposition in this regional setting, before unpacking the habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations.

4.3.1 A comment on the origins of habits in Southeast Asia

As Chapter 3 argued, habitual dispositions emerge from precedent and iteration. They are impacted by authoritative actors and by perceptions of efficacy within a community or field of practitioners. Once pushed into the cognitive background they circumscribe both perception and action and come to define ‘normal’ relations.

While a full analysis of the emergence and development of Southeast Asian diplomatic habits is beyond the scope of this Chapter, probing their origins suggests that they follow this logic. The distinctive Southeast Asian habitual disposition, as explored below, has its origins in the culturally-specific practices of member states and have been transmitted within the bounds of a particular institutional context by authoritative actors, something made possible by their perceived efficacy. As will be demonstrated, these habits rest on collectively-held and culturally-distinct foundations within a community. For example, the consensus model centered on traditional Malay village practices of ‘musjawarah’ (consultation) and ‘mufakat’ (consensus) are often cited by scholars this regard (e.g. Acharya, 1998: 211-212; Almote, 1997/98: 81; Ba, 2013: 145-146; Beeson, 2009: 21; Collins, 2013: 35-36), and some suggest that they are part of a larger and common Southeast Asian culture (Kivimaki, 2001: 16). Similarly, others have examined the common experiences with colonialism and the threat of Chinese domination, and the dynamic effect externally introduced norms and practices of inter-state interaction have had within the region (Acharya, 2004; Ba, 2013; Haacke, 2003; Womack, 2008). While the origins of the habitual elements likely rest in common experience, it is their practice
by leading regional states that has reified them as given qualities of regional relations here.

Further, while there is variation in habituation and practice, their practice by leading regional actors informs community relations more widely. Indonesia is of particular importance, as I explore below, having been the ‘primus inter pares’ in terms of political security integration within the region (Collins, 2014: 277; see also Rattanasevee, 2014; Smith, 1999; Thompson, 2015). Further, ASEAN as an organizational setting is often recognized for its particularly insular level of decision-making, the very setting in which practices are likely to see habituation (Ba, 2006: 168-169, 174-175; Katsumata, 2006: 185-186; Kivimaki, 2001: 14). Here, the “peculiar, small world that multilateral diplomats inhabit” is just that, and the transmission of habitual practices likely (Pouliot, 2011: 546).

Relying on the methodology and methods described in Chapter 3 the remainder of this chapter explores first the existence and then the effect of the habitual disposition of Southeast Asian diplomatic relations.

4.4 The Existence of a Southeast Asian Habitual Disposition

With a more narrow focus on habituated practices, even qualities of regional relations appear salient. There are three interrelated processual attributes of Southeast Asian habits, including the practice of consensus, informal dialogue, and a privileging of process over substance. Similarly, the content or substance of these habits are three-fold, including thinking from non-interference, equality among member states, and face-saving. There is a seventh habitual element, the proclivity towards informal pacific dispute settlement, which blurs this analytic divide. Many of these attributes exist as codified norms within and beyond the region. However, they are understood and practiced in particular ways among regional practitioners and with particular consequence. Taken together, these deeply ingrained qualities of regional diplomacy make up the Southeast Asian habitual disposition.
4.4.1 Habituated Process

The ‘norm’ of consensus decision-making is referenced as fundamental in both the 2003 Bali Concord II and the 2007 Charter, as well as engrained in more mundane aspects of ASEAN, including the Connectivity Coordinating Committee (2011) and the yet to be utilized Protocol on Enhanced Dispute Settlement Mechanism (2004). More importantly, however, consensus decision-making is a process assumed natural and normal in and through ASEAN daily practice. As one Thai diplomat described it, consensus is “the only game in town.” A senior Malaysian diplomat echoed this, and the underlying sense of community that makes it possible, when he suggested that it was simply “how we play our game.” This statement parallels the suggestion that practical sense is best understood as a socially constituted ‘sense of the game.’ However, ASEAN’s is a particular practice of consensus.

As one European diplomat with years of experience in the region noted, consensus in ASEAN is not “procedural consensus in a strict sense.” Rather, it is a prior and inherent consensus-seeking practice, a distinct and intrinsic understanding of what the norm of consensus means in and through practice. Consensus is sought before formal deliberation and is done intuitively in reference to expectations. It is a lived and practiced sensibility within this community of practitioners. While many practitioners explicitly cite the norm of “musyawarah dan mufakat” – the notion that consultation produces consensus through discussion – there is much that does not reach the negotiation table as a result of the practice of this prior consensus (see also Acharya, 2014: 44; Beeson, 2009: 21). In short, ASEAN practitioners know and practice consensus in particular and habitual ways.

As another EU official explained, among ASEAN states they “do not search for compromise. There is either general agreement from the drafting of the agenda – from the
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56 Interview with Thai official, Jakarta July 1, 2014. As noted in Chapter 2, interviewees are generally anonymous unless otherwise noted. In this chapter and the next anonymous interviewees referred to using alternating male and female pronouns. All interviews noted in this chapter were conducted in Jakarta, Indonesia in June and July of 2014. All were conducted in English.
57 Interview with Malaysian official, Jakarta, July 22, 2014.
58 Interview with European official, July 17, 2014.
beginning – or they just drop it [an issue].” The ASEAN habit of consensus is distinct from the European, despite a shared norm. In ASEAN, this naturalized practice generates a reluctance to pursue issues of apparent national importance when deemed outside of possible consensus prior to discussion and debate. A senior Indonesian diplomat recalled this practice in daily action. She noted that upon entering a meeting she “will map the room and [know] this and this country will be supportive of our idea, and this and this will not.” By this she was suggesting that she knows at the onset what will be possible, and what will not. It is assumed that pushing a controversial issue or agenda is simply not possible.

An illustration of this reality in the summer of 2014 was the pressure within some member states to produce a common ASEAN statement regarding the Russian annexation of Crimea. The annexation coincided with a swell of interest at the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC) in making good on the 2011 Bali Concord III’s ambition to collectively “promote the role of the ASEAN Community in the global community of nations.” As one ASEC official recalled, some member states wished to see “a statement from ASEAN, not to criticize, but to state a position.” However, as he remarked, “I knew, sitting in the back there listening to this discussion, that it is not going to fly. After a few years in the Secretariat, you know.” There was no clear consensus at the onset and the conversation was over before it started. This intimate knowledge of what is possible and not given prior consensus among member states was a reoccurring if inarticulate reality for many practitioners. Two other senior ASEC officials echoed this sentiment. As one explained,

\[
\text{Let’s say, am coming from country A and I propose that I want to do ‘this’ and I am [supported] by two other countries. Then seven don’t think that this is good for us, because we’ve had problem in this way or in that way. Then, we leave it at that. We don’t come and show off or push for ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Within a meeting we can already feel it, whether it is sellable or not sellable. I don’t think the country proposing it, after looking at seven countries, is going to be comfortable with it. They know this. This is how we work. This is probably what they call the ‘ASEAN way’}.\]

---

59 Interview with European official, July 17, 2014.
60 Interview with Indonesian official, Jakarta, June 17 2014.
61 Interview with ASEAN official, Jakarta, July 16, 2014.
62 Interview with two ASEAN officials, Jakarta, July 7, 2014.
At this point a second ASEC official interrupted to reinforce the point: “even if one country feels uncomfortable with your proposal, you have to understand that.” Even though a number of states may have wished to make a minor and symbolic statement upholding their view of both the importance of territorial sovereignty internationally and the precedent setting Bali Concord III, with any hesitation, there was no debate or discussion. This is the inherent and habituated practice of prior consensus that ASEAN diplomacy rests upon. In practice, it is something member states think from rather than about. This is the inherent and habituated practice of prior consensus that ASEAN diplomacy rests upon. In practice, it is something member states think from rather than about. Deviations from it, as we can see, do exist but they are seen as deviations from what is natural and normal – and from what is assumed not only the ‘only game in town’ but also a fundamentally productive one. As the first ASEC official in this conversation continued, “that [practice of prior consensus] has allowed ASEAN to work for the last 47 years.” There is a ‘feeling’ or an inherent and articulate knowledge that comes form lived experience in and of ASEAN relations.

This was brought into focus in an interview with the first Indonesian Permanent Representative to ASEAN, Gede Ngurah Swajaya, who admonished me, as a Canadian, for Canada not having a Permanent Mission to ASEAN. In his view, “you can’t attend an hour and a half ministerial meeting and understand [regional relations].”63 As the Ambassador continued, “Sometimes it is very difficult to explain [this] to [foreign] politicians. Unless they have been to this region and this part of the region [the ASEC itself], then they understand. For those who have never been here, it will not be easy to understand.” Regional relations must be practiced and lived to be known.

The effect of this lived experience is to circumscribe the issues that are debated and discussed, and, as will be explored, may often make possible a toleration of violence within the region. For many non-ASEAN practitioners who confront this reality, this is neither normal nor efficacious. As an American official noted, “It is almost never an ‘I’m adamant against it!’ But an ‘oh, I’m not comfortable with that.’ And that is harder to deal

63 Interview with Ambassador Gede Ngurah Swajaya, Jakarta, July 30, 2014.
As she continued, “…they [ASEAN states] are going to have to get more comfortable getting on the phone and talking with one another and saying look: ‘can we work this out’ in the *normal way that diplomacy works*” (emphasis added). In her view, this practice of prior consensus was not the “normal way that diplomacy works.” Rather, it was a “frustrating” and pervasive feature of regional diplomacy. Relatedly, an EU official remarked that it is “best to define something in reference to what it is not” and ASEAN “is not the EU – black is not white.” In these views, ASEAN is distinct and problematic in its approach to consensus-making. This two-fold suggestion – the naturalness of consensus for ASEAN practitioners and opposite view for non-ASEAN practitioners – underscores the habitual quality of this regional practice.

Further, and relatedly, there is an inherent focus on the importance of ‘process’ over result that has been habituated among practitioners and expressed through a preference for procedural informality. In a common refrain, Dewi Fortuna Anwar, a prominent advisor to the Indonesian Vice-President, brought these backgrounded practices to the fore when she suggested that in ASEAN “you don’t set the goals. The journey is the important thing.” Many ASEAN interviewees were quick to defend the slow and incomplete realization of the ASEAN Community of 2015 suggesting this was a “process” rather than an end, and something very much distinct from the European experience. By this, all meant that despite the thresholds and specifics of economic (and to some extent political) integration noted in the 2009 Roadmap for an ASEAN Community, there was a general sense that its completion meant less than the undertaking. As former Indonesian Foreign Minister Hassan Wirajuda, whose tenure spans the development of the Community framework, remarked: “when people criticize that ASEAN will not be able to implement the community standards by 2015… it is not the case. This is a process. It’s not that [by] January 2016, it must be one hundred percent.” This was echoed by an ASEC staff member who suggested the Community is
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64 Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
65 Interview with EU official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014.
66 Interview with Dewi Fortuna Anwar, Jakarta, June 25, 2014.
67 Interview with Foreign Minister Hassan Wirajuda, Jakarta, July 24, 2014.
“not an event; it’s a process”,\textsuperscript{68} while another suggested I should expect, in his words, “no [big] bang” on 1 January 2016.\textsuperscript{69} Moreover, this is a messy, gradual, and often informal process. As a senior ASEC official noted,

the whole Community-building process is interpreted in different ways. How deep you want to get into it, or how much under the surface you want to take it, really depends on the sectors. You’d be surprised: the sectors define what it is. They may say, ‘what we see in the Blue Print is unachievable, and we don’t know who put it there,’ and they may just go and do something else.\textsuperscript{70}

For the Dialogue Partners, this inherent assumption of informality and the natural focus on process over outcome is puzzling. These views of non-member state practitioners working with ASEAN, again, serve to illuminate these habituated qualities of relations. As one EU official noted bluntly: “Process is a term used to mask ignorance.”\textsuperscript{71} In the view of another, ASEAN is simply “reactive”, “not driven by an agenda,” and “has no vision.”\textsuperscript{72} In her view, there was no set end to this ‘process’ and no thinking analogous to the founders of the EU regionalism – her assumed normal way that diplomacy works. As one American diplomat recalled, the “strongest words” he had ever heard stated to the CPR was from a Japanese ambassador during the annual and informal CPR-DP Ambassador consultation after the establishment of the 2009 Roadmap, when it was stated that “We [Dialogue Partners] don’t know what your [ASEAN] vision is long term – what you really want to be. And without that we are having a hard time thinking about how we are going to support you.”\textsuperscript{73} In the view of the American diplomat present, this was a stark and blunt, but common concern among his non-member state colleagues, and again serves to bring the ‘normal way’ ASEAN diplomacy works into juxtaposition. In these accounts, the non-member state ‘other’ sees a lack of clear vision and real progress as abnormal and suboptimal, while such a reality is given and unproblematic for member state diplomats. For these Dialogue Partners, the inherent assumption of informality and the natural focus on process over outcome is frustrating for they undercut the utility of the

\textsuperscript{68} Interview with ASEAN official, Jakarta, June 9, 2014.
\textsuperscript{69} Interview with ASEAN official, Jakarta, July 4, 2014.
\textsuperscript{70} Interview with ASEAN official, Jakarta, July 10, 2014.
\textsuperscript{71} Interview with German official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014.
\textsuperscript{72} Interview with EU official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014.
\textsuperscript{73} Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
carefully negotiated thresholds, many of which they helped to devise and monitor through financial support to the ASEC and the ASEAN Integration Monitoring Office (AIMO).

For other many non-member state diplomats, the inherent focus on process and informal dialogue is not only ineffective but also places the region in jeopardy. As a European official suggested, the Chinese claims to the South China Sea should have compelled change in regional policy and led to a collective reorientation to address the growing threat to ASEAN states. This, of course, has not been the case. In her view, there is a “conceptual incapacity in ASEAN to understand what is at stake” in the South China Sea. “The dragon that sits there is heavy and there is fire from its nose” and yet regional unity in response is elusive. She continued, “If three or four European states had such an issue, we would come together.” For the EU official, ‘normal diplomacy’ would produce a stronger and collective position. However, AESAN diplomacy – resting on habituated practices of consensus, informality and process over substance – restricts vision and action. These habitual practices temper how states perceive risks and circumscribe responses to crises – be it external threats to territorial sovereignty or intra-regional border disputes. For regional practitioners, these three aspects of process are the normal way that diplomacy works, in practice. Through them, three other aspects of regional relations are transmitted as unproblematic and natural.

4.4.2 Habituated Content

In terms of this transmitted content, there are three prominent themes that are deeply interrelated and deeply taken-for-granted in intra-regional relations: a particular understanding of non-interference, assumptions of a basic equality of regional states, and an impulse toward face-saving among member states.

74 In November of 2015 ASEAN defense ministers mirrored the July 2012 failure of foreign ministers to release a joint communiqué to conclude their annual meeting. On the more recent development see Torbati and Leong (2015).

75 Interview with German official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014.
Non-interference is a norm within and beyond the region (Jackson, 2000). It is codified as a foundational principle of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC), signed at the First ASEAN Summit in 1976. It recurs explicitly, if briefly, in the Bali Concord II (2003) and again with the relative formalization of the organization through the Charter, and with implicit reference in the 2009 Roadmap for an ASEAN Community (A.2.16). For many, this suggests a foundational norm and one that defines the appropriate behaviour of regional member states (e.g. Acharya, 2014; Ba, 2009). Yet, as with an understanding of consensus, how non-interference has been habituated in practice is, from an external standpoint, divorced from its evocation on paper. ASEAN practitioners think from a foundational assumption of non-interference and they do so in a particular way.76

Minister Hassan begins to make this clear with his suggestion that ASEAN states, in practice, know that non-interference is not “sacrosanct.”77 Rather, it is a baseline of respect for territorial sovereignty, and in particular the deployment of uniformed military personnel within each other’s territory for humanitarian or any other purpose. This principle bends when the common interests of ASEAN – however loosely defined – are deemed to be at stake by powerful member states. As the Minister explained, ASEAN is “a family of ten countries. As siblings, we have the right to know what is happening in the family of our sisters and brothers… If we discuss and raise an issue, say a violation of human rights in one ASEAN member, its not because we wish to interfere.” This understanding of non-interference is distinct from that of external practitioners. For example, one European official critiqued this assumption of non-interference as merely a “smokescreen”.78 In his view, non-interference in ASEAN is “something they [member states] shore up in order to do the opposite…like saying ‘I love you’ every day, over and over, only to stab you in the back! And then say, ‘I didn’t do that! How could I? I love you!’” While perhaps hyperbolic, this view underscores the distinctiveness of this quality of ASEAN relations in practice. No member assumes a hard and fast rule. Rather,

76 Jones (2010) rejects assumptions that non-interference has been upheld in practice. In his view, it has waned as a result of the strategic interests of powerful ASEAN states. He does not, however, explore how practitioners understand non-interference as practical sense.
77 Interview with Foreign Minister Hassan Wirajuda, Jakarta, July 24, 2014.
78 Interview with German official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014.
it is an inclination towards maintaining the territorial integrity and sovereignty of member states, but in so doing also preserving ASEAN as the organization through which to achieve this and other regional aims (see also Collins, 2013: 36-37). This understanding alludes to the second habituated aspect of content, an assumption of equality among member states. This quality informs the consensus-seeking practices and produces a dispositional impulse towards keeping regional issues within the region.

ASEAN’s response to Cyclone Nargis, which devastated Myanmar in May of 2008, serves to illustrate these dynamics. The worst natural disaster in Myanmar’s history required international attention and aid. The closed regime under the military junta refused initial offers of aid. For powerful ASEAN states, chiefly Indonesia and Singapore, it was clear that if ASEAN did not facilitate the opening of Myanmar to international aid it risked losing international credibility. A senior Indonesian diplomat explained: “ASEAN was implicated. ASEAN was blamed.” As he recalls of the 19 May 2008 Foreign Minister’s meeting immediately following the 2 May cyclone, it was clear to the room that Myanmar needed to support ASEAN interests even if it meant compromising its own. There was a shared sense that “Yes, the lack of democracy and human rights [in Myanmar] certainly may inflame ASEAN, but you know, here on the very day of this emergency situation, [Myanmar’s] rejection of any international offer [means] ASEAN [is] also implicated.” Prior consensus had previously rendered some issues mute – a lack of democracy despite the Charter’s insistence and abhorrent human rights violations. However, a tension now arose as, collectively, ASEAN’s credibility was on the line. Indonesia and Singapore, in particular, recognized the need to respond to international pressure, even if it meant intervention into domestic affairs.

Prior to the Ministers meeting, Minister Hassan met with Singaporean Foreign Minister George Yeo in private. The two agreed that Indonesia would present three potential solutions to Myanmar, knowing this to be comfortable to the rest of the membership. In line with proclivities towards face-saving and the pressures of non-interference, during
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79 Interview with anonymous Indonesian official, July 2014.
80 This account comes from an interview with ex-Indonesian Permanent Representative Gede Ngurah Swajaya, Jakarta, July 30, 2014.
the meeting seven member states spoke before Indonesia, offering only condolences. Then, Hassan offered the three options. First, Myanmar could follow the precedent of Indonesia after the 2004 tsunami in Aceh, and allow international aid unencumbered. Hassan cautioned against this choice – unfettered access by the international community could be destabilizing to the junta. The second option was for ASEAN to play a mediating role between Myanmar and international offers. The third was to simply do nothing. At this point the Foreign Minister of Myanmar, Nyan Win, was told to reflect carefully on Myanmar’s contribution to ASEAN and ASEAN’s support of Myanmar. With this, Minister Hassan was given the personal agreement that option two was the favored path. The Minister pushed back, asking for the official decision from Naypyidaw. After a short recess and a call to the capital, the agreement was set and Myanmar received aid from all quarters.

A senior Indonesian diplomat remarked upon reflection of this event, that it may not have been “too ASEAN, to avoid friction and problems [and] to ensure harmonious relations. But, this was a problem… [and] we needed to deal with it rationally.”81 A senior Malaysian diplomat echoed this assumption by suggesting that during such moments of crisis “commonsense plays a big role in our decision-makers.”82 The rationality or commonsense that existed in that Foreign Ministers’ meeting underscores the complicated practice of non-interference, and the relationship between norms and practice. For these practitioners, this was not inconsistent with the norm of non-interference. It was natural, unproblematic, and practical to reconcile these perhaps immediately irreconcilable pressures – to uphold national sovereignty by allowing the needs of the supra-regional ASEAN to overstep it. From an external viewpoint, the ASEAN practice of non-interference appears incongruous with the norm invoked in official rhetoric and agreements. This perceived counter-intuitiveness is echoed by the frustrations of our EU official, and yet is lost on ASEAN practitioners. In short, the codified norm has been habituated and practiced in a particular and competent way.

81 Interview with anonymous Indonesian official, July 2014.
82 Interview with Malaysian official, July 22, 2014.
Third, there is a taken-for-granted practice of face-saving, and one that stems from equality and familial dynamic explored (see also Beeson, 2009). There is an inherent apprehension to allow any member state to appear a lesser partner or to expose a member state to the critiques of actors external to the region.\(^{83}\) Practitioners assume this unthinkingly. As Anwar suggested, “Shaming and naming is not acceptable. Telling people what to do and expecting them to do it not acceptable. It just does not work here… If you want to be more effective, you go and you do it in a way that does not cause people to lose face.”\(^{84}\) Behaviours that, from an external standpoint, may appear normatively and even legally deviant are not critiqued within ASEAN, and states are often sheltered from external critique.

When I spoke with interviewees in the summer of 2014, the recent coup in Thailand was fresh on the ASEAN mind. Officials faced two immediate concerns. First, was an impulse to save-face for Thailand and ensure there was no overt critique of the coup, despite it appearing to contravene legal norms and rules spelled out in the Charter (Article 2.2.h). In tension with this impulse was concern, once again, for ASEAN credibility. From an external viewpoint, this was a fine line between exclusivity in aims. As one Permanent Representative described it,

> After the coup, the Thais did not want ASEAN to convene a special meeting just to talk about Thailand. But… Thailand is a very important member of ASEAN – the second largest economy – and given the developments in Thailand, I think ASEAN’s credibility would be at stake if we did not even talk about it. I think Thailand knows that. They recognize that.\(^{85}\)

Regarding any possible admonishment she stated unequivocally, “We would never do that.” This was clear to her, in practice. From an external standpoint, this is not clear legally or normatively, given the Charter, where a core and explicit principle is that member states shall act with “adherence to the rule of law, good governance, the principles of democracy and constitutional government” (Article 2.2.h; see also Article 1.6). In practice, the proclivity towards face-saving overrode concerns of the possible legal implications of the coup – namely that a breach of the Charter should be raised

\(^{83}\) That the episode of Myanmar’s acquiescence to Indonesia’s three-part suggestion was something many practitioners did not wish to speak about is, itself, telling of this reality.
\(^{84}\) Interview with Dewi Fortuna Anwar, Jakarta, June 25, 2014.
\(^{85}\) Interview with ASEAN Permanent Representative, Jakarta, July 18, 2014.
publically at the ASEAN Summit (Article 5.2-3 and Article 20). A high-ranking ASEC political-security official, the very person who could best recognize a breach of ASEAN norms and principles, echoed this reality:

Immediately [after the coup] there were some countries that stopped their bilateral aid or any high level ties... But, at a time like this, perhaps, what they [the Thais] need most is support, rather than derision, rather than criticism, rather than put-me-downs. Because, again, you have got to understand the context of where Thailand was…the nuance, the cultural settings of why we do certain things in a certain way… I would never be in a position to criticize the Thailand military… [Rather, ASEAN should say:] ‘We would hope that you [the Thai military government] will be able to resolve this. Go to it.’ Of course, there is a provision in the Charter. It’s got something about the overthrow of the government and all that sort of stuff… but does anybody… [he gets up, walks over to her/his desk and picks up a copy of the Charter and waves it in the air, tapping its cover]

Does the leader brandish the book and [he taps on the hardcover] say ‘You, you! You have violated the Charter!’? No. Nobody does it. We don’t do it in ASEAN! We talk, and say, ‘let’s try and do something about it.’ But, we still come to the table.86

This is precisely the habitual and dispositional character of regional diplomacy at work. Despite the blatant challenge to a core principle of the ASEAN Charter, the practice is to engage in informal talk amongst members, to save-face, and to maintain stability in relations within the community. That the very official who would be able to criticize the Thai military government for not adhering to a core principle of the Charter knows that he “would never be in a position” to do so demonstrates this keenly. In all my interviews there was never any suggestion of condemning Thailand, or engaging external actors to assist with the return of democracy. Indeed, as the ASEC official continued, post-coup relations with Thailand remained “business as usual” and despite his vantage point in the Political-Security section of the ASEC, he commented: “I don’t think it is a major issue, from how I see it.” The basic habitual disposition of ASEAN practitioners, again, serves to limit the ‘imaginability and thinkability of interests and choice’ over this important regional issue, even when – from an external perspective – it seems to clearly contravene the norms and stated rules of the organization.

This face-saving practice materialized in ASEAN dealings with its Dialogue Partners as well. According to a source within ASEC in attendance, in preparation for a July 2014 meeting with Canadian representatives, an ASEAN member state-only meeting was held

86 Interview with ASEC official, Jakarta, July 16, 2014.
just prior. There was common concern that the Canadians would raise the recent developments within Thailand and thus unsettle the Thai delegation. The ASEAN member states, collectively, decided that when such concerns were inevitably raised, the Thai delegation would respond just briefly, where upon Vietnam would “immediately” interject to provide a description of the ASEAN position on the South China Sea in order to shift to a “larger issue” and “deflect any critique” of the Thai coup, leaving it to ASEAN to respond or not to the coup. In the words of another senior ASEC official, this “is basically [our] way of dealing with things: don’t bring your neighbors in. Solve it among family.”

The suggestion here is two fold, and it speaks to the underlying habit of the region in response to crises of all sorts. First, member states assume the region as a singular community of equals and as distinct from states external to it. A family of states may be flowery language, but it underscores this basic reality as given for practitioners. Second, within this in-group, there is a dispositional impulse to save-face for the members in the light of an international gaze and to ensure regional issues are dealt with internal to the region. It is automatically assumed that debate and disagreement should rest within ASEAN, and when a compromise comes at the expense of a member state it should not be presented as such internationally.

Finally, and as seen in the above discussion, there is a proclivity towards pacific dispute settlement of intra-regional disputes. This follows widely established norms within and beyond the region, and in particular as enshrined as a guiding principle within the Charter (Article 2.2.d). However, regional practitioners’ practical and habitual understanding and behaviour in this regard is particular. The central legal mechanism for conflict resolution within ASEAN rests with the High Council, a grouping of ministerial-level representatives empowered by the TAC and upheld by the Charter. Yet, to date this formal means of dispute mediation has never been utilized (Acharya, 2014: 49). Similarly, the 2004 Enhanced Dispute Settlement Mechanism (EDSM) for economic
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87 Interview with ASEC official, Jakarta, July 8, 2014.
88 Interview with ASEC official, Jakarta, July 16, 2014.
89 On self-other distinctions in regard see Hayes (2013: 26) and Pouliot (2012: 215).
disputes, also enshrined in the Charter, has not yet been employed (Koesnaidi et al., 2014). Eschewing formal and legal channels, ASEAN practitioners assume the possibility conflict resolution only through informal dialogue, something that manifests in the practice of this abstract codified norm (see also Acharya, 1998: 211). Southeast Asian diplomatic practitioners ‘know’ this the only game in town, and, when forced to reflect on it, ‘know’ it is productive of regional stability.

However, what is both given and effective for regional practitioners is a puzzlingly suboptimal choice for external actors. For one American diplomat in Jakarta, ASEAN diplomacy is simply “insane.”90 Similarly, an Australian official suggested that ASEAN has a “particular habit of cooperation, and it is a strange one.”91 From this external vantage point, ASEAN officials understand and practice diplomacy and the principled and codified norms upon which it rests in a distinct way. A senior ASEC official recalled an experience in the Secretariat that makes this distinction clear:

I remember an EU consultant once threatened us [ASEC staff]: ‘if you don’t do it like this you’ll never achieve what you want to do, because you have to have this [as she bangs on the table] in place and have these outputs by this time, otherwise it won’t work!’ You know what happened to him? We kicked him out! ... We knew he was right, and that he was leading us in a [good] direction, we just didn’t like the way he said it. So, we kicked him out.92

This keenly illustrates Iver B. Neumann’s (2002: 637) suggestion; “practice speaks: this is how we have always done things around here.”

To summarize, seven qualities inform how Southeast Asian practitioners ‘do things around here’: prior consensus, informal dialogue, privileging process over substance, non-interference, equality among ASEAN states, an impulse towards face-saving, and pacific dispute settlement through talk rather than formal legal channels. Each quality of this regional habitual deposition has been uncovered through detailed interviews with regional practitioners and brought into distinctive relief through parallel interviews with extra-regional officials working closely alongside Southeast Asian practitioners. This
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90 Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
91 Interview with Australian official, Jakarta, July 18, 2014.
92 Interview with ASEC official, Jakarta, July 16, 2014.
method is crucial in uncovering these qualities that regional diplomats and officials think from rather than about. As outlined in Chapter 3, the statements and stories explored above show case what is deeply held as given, normal and indeed efficacious by regional practitioners. Through interviews the existence of a distinctive habitual disposition – how diplomacy and regional relations actually works for Southeast Asian officials – is clear. While many of these qualities may appear to align with the codified norms of the region and beyond, it is the particular regional understandings that shape behaviour and particular practices that are most consequential for regional relations. Together, these habitual and dispositional qualities form the foundation Southeast Asian diplomatic practitioners think and act from. In short, there is clear evidence of the existence of a Southeast Asian habitual disposition. In the following section I turn to explore it effects.

4.5 Habits and Regional Relations

By establishing a practical sense of regional relations, this habitual disposition allows cooperation absent or prior to the development of collective identity and we-ness as often conceived in IR literature. Despite the rifts and divisions that produce only a thin veneer of a normative framework in the region – or “a very shallow form of regional identity” (Checkel, 2014a: 9) – there is a multi-faceted and consequential habitual disposition within this region that shapes regional security cooperation. Habits act as the primary lens through which ASEAN practitioners view regional relations and regional crises more specifically, and they provide the particular content and expression of otherwise abstract norms. While habits of European diplomacy may have produced a classical security community, in Southeast Asia this dynamic has produced something rather different. Here, the regional disposition serves to structure and pattern relations in a particular way, with long-term peace yet periodic and violent conflict short of war that is assumed as almost business as usual. Understanding how this dispositional set of traits serves to restrict the escalation of conflict and lead to this patterned state of affairs is challenging. One glimpse of this relationship stems from practitioners themselves. What they know as normal and efficacious is a signifier in this regard.
4.5.1 Habits and their Effects I. Robust Habits

ASEAN practitioners share a belief in the pacific reality of their region, and they credit their diplomatic practice as key to this assumed success. While practitioners find their habits difficult to recognize, when pushed to reflect on their daily practices and when their sense of normal relations is presented as problematic, many are defensive. Aware of critiques of ASEAN and its forums as ‘talk shops’ (Burton, 2007; Katsumata, 2006) or productive of “process not progress” (Jones and Smith, 2007), many respond that talk is the foundation of regional cooperation. “Is it better to talk, or to shoot each other?” was a common sentiment, as another ASEAN official asked rhetorically. Minister Hassan suggested this logic with greater nuance:

On the notion that ASEAN is nothing but a forum [for] talk, well I would argue that it was because of dialogue, because of talk, that here [in Southeast Asia] we enjoy peace and security – and continued peace and security. And people would appreciate [this] better if we [were] compared to other regions. Look at what is happening in the Middle East or some parts of Africa. It is because the[se] respective regions were not able to manage their own household [that they lack peace and security].

For these practitioners talk is action, and the habits of regional relations circumscribe conflict management. A recurring example from my interviews serves to bring this dynamic into light. The long-running tension between Malaysia and Indonesia that characterized the period of Confrontasi in the 1960s in some ways remain. This was palpable in a number of interviews with practitioners on both sides. A senior Malaysian diplomat, for example, remarked of the “mistrust” he and his government still have over issues such as the Sipadan and Ligitan Islands, despite the 2002 International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruling, and migrant workers (Guerin, 2005). Similarly, an Indonesian official suggested that there remains a “sensitivity between Indonesia and Malaysia” that makes policy-makers “uneasy to continue building relations between Indonesia and Malaysia.” In particular there were concerns on both sides that while mistrust and unease remained at the government level, deeper antagonisms remained among their
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93 Interview with Indonesian official, Jakarta, July 14, 2014.
94 Interview with Foreign Minister Hassan Wirajuda, Jakarta, July 24, 2014
95 Interview with Malaysian official, Jakarta, July 22, 2014.
96 Interview with Indonesian official, Jakarta, July 23, 2014.
publics and militaries. However, conflicts do not escalate between the two states. As Anwar reflected,

Tempers flare between the navies of Malaysia and Indonesia over our maritime boundaries. But, at the higher level we say, ‘you know, we’ve got the TAC and we cannot resolve disputes through conflict or war.’ So, when, in Indonesia or Malaysia, the President is under pressure from Parliament or from the media who say, you know, ‘oh, we should fight for it!’ both governments will say: ‘we created ASEAN. We have this code of conduct in order to prevent open conflict from happening’… There is no enforcement mechanism, but [ASEAN via the TAC] creates a framework in which governments can restrain themselves when facing one another, [and] also a basis of argument when dealing with their citizens.97

As explored above, while practitioners ‘know’ they have codified norms and principles in the TAC, and elsewhere, the understanding and practice of these norms is particular. One such ‘flare’ came in March 2005 when Indonesian First Admiral Abdul Malik Yusuf was quoted as saying: “We will not let an inch of our land or a drop of our ocean fall into the hands of foreigners” and it was noted that the “Indonesian military is clearly ready to assume battle positions” (quoted in McBeth, 2012). Anwar denotes a sense of restraint absent recourse to formal enforcement mechanisms. For her, as for ASEAN practitioners more generally, there is a business as usual aspect to conflict within the region, and an inherent assumption that they will not escalate further.98 That many such ‘flares’ have not been resolved and that increases in military spending after this event appeared directed at increasing security along this border, suggest that while conflicts may be muted through ASEAN practices they may not be resolved (Guerin, 2005; Kivimaki, 2008; McBeth, 2012).99

In speaking with regional officials at the ambassadorial level, there was a shared sense that while such low-level conflict remained a possibility it had little effect at the broader level. Thus, Anwar was able to brush aside the Indo-Malay disputes as inconsequential and, as I explore below, large-scale violence between Thailand and Cambodia could occur as the Roadmap for an ASEAN Community was being devised and as the Charter

97 Interview with Dewi Fortuna Anwar, Jakarta, June 25, 2014.
98 For a similar statement on the trend towards living with rather than resolving conflict, see Kivimaki (2008).
99 Acharya (1998: 216) notes a similar dynamic as a pervasive feature of ASEAN relations, where war is absent but military planning and arms spending indicates that peaceful assumptions of change may be fragile.
entered into force. For ASEAN practitioners, there is a business as usual aspect to conflict within the region. While this attitude is widely shared among ASEAN practitioners, they were often unable to articulate why or how their brand of diplomacy generates peace or manages conflict – it itself suggestive of how habitually ingrained these qualities of regional relations and conflict management are.

Near the conclusion of my interviews I often asked why regional conflicts do not escalate, despite a lack of recourse to formal channels to mediate or resolve them. No interviewee could offer a clear response. The majority found it difficult to grapple with the question, mentally unpacking the taken-for-granted assumption that the particular means of regional relations, as they know it, tempered if not resolved crises. As one ASEC official remarked of the potential oddity of ASEAN practices, “It’s really not a matter of unique or not unique. It’s which one works for ASEAN… It is a necessity that works most effectively.”

While both self-evident and effective for AESAN practitioners, this habitual disposition is strange and inefficacious to others. One European diplomat, with years experience in the ASEAN region, expressed bewilderment with his ASEAN colleagues. As illustration of his frustrations, he explained that recently he had been tasked with organizing and reporting on two lunch meetings. One was between his Ambassador and the ten-member Committee of Permanent Representatives, the highest-level grouping at the ASEC, made up of Ambassadorial level representatives from ASEAN states. The second was between the Ambassador and ASEAN Dialogue Partners. Of the latter, he offered a full report and described it as productive and positive. Frustratingly, as he recalled of the former, “I couldn’t make a report. There was nothing to report.” Despite an hours long meeting and much talk, for him, there was nothing to observe and articulate as consequential when observing the kind of dialogue that came from ASEAN members. In his view, ASEAN talk was just that. As another EU official remarked, “Strangely, this group holds

100 Pouliot (2010: 116) notes a similar finding from his 2006 interviews with practitioners at the NATO-Russia Council. See also Holmes (2013).
101 Interview with ASEC official, Jakarta, July 2, 2014.
102 Interview with EU official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014.
together. That is the real miracle." In this view, ASEAN “is not unsuccessful, it is just not what we expect it to be.” This is precisely the point: ASEAN may appear bizarre and ineffective, slow and informal, but it simply works for ASEAN member states in ways unfathomable to those external to it. Moreover, productive and ‘working’ diplomacy in the region does not mean an absence of conflict. Rather, the habitual qualities of the region lead to a toleration of violence by regional practitioners. A deepening of regional relations is possible and attainable, despite continued regional conflict. To explore this suggestion further, I turn to a case of habits in action.

4.5.2 Habits and their Effects II. Habits and a “Small War”

In 2008 and again in 2011, a period that spans the development and implementation of the 2009 Roadmap for an ASEAN Community and the Charter’s entry into force, numerous and often large-scale military clashes occurred along the Thai-Cambodian border between these two ASEAN members. Tensions along the border and over the disputed 11th century temple complex had been stoked by increased Thai nationalism and a rise in political violence from 2006 to 2010, and led to a tense three-year standoff between thousands of soldiers. The relatively low fatalities indicate the remoteness of the violence, not the intensity.

In February 2011 fighting escalated to its greatest heights and Cambodian troops used the temple complex, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, as a base from which to fire (International Crisis Group, 2011: 17-18). Beyond mere skirmishes under brinkmanship tensions, three days of fighting included the use of tanks and multi-launcher rockets in attacks “planned well in advance” (International Crisis Group, 2011: 18). Artillery shells and rockets damaged villages, the temple complex itself, and an ASEAN buffer school built to facilitate regional integration, killing nine and displacing more than 33,000. Thailand was accused of using cluster munitions (Chachavalpongpun, 2013: 73; International Crisis Group, 2011: 17-19; Fredrickson, 2011). Two months later, two

103 Interview with EU official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014
weeks of clashes in April and May saw another 55,000 displaced and claims that more than 50,000 Thai artillery shells had been fired as far as 20 kilometers into Cambodian territory (International Crisis Group, 2011: 22).

This was sufficient for many recognize it as the “most violent clash yet between ASEAN’s members,” a war in all but name, or indeed a “small war” (Chachavalpongpun, 2013: 72; Sothirak, 2013; Wain, 2012). In Acharya’s view this was “perhaps the most serious threat to ASEAN’s intra-mural peace” (2014: 125). For others it is sufficient to deny talk of an ASEAN ‘security community’ by definition (Collins, 2014: 284; see also Thambipillai et al, 2010: 23 and Cheang 2008).

Strangely, however, this conflict has received little attention in IR. Acharya devotes only passing reference to it in the third edition of his central piece on ASEAN integration norms and others pass it by due to the limited fatalities (2014: 125, 157 and see Kivimaki 2012). Acharya’s (2014: 125) conclusion – that this conflict produced only “disrupted security relations” rather than “outright military conflict” – serves to belie the intensity and severity of the violence and destruction, as well as the potential escalatory nature of this centuries old dispute. As a result of glancing past the severity and risks, IR has not adequately addressed the particular impact of the habits of regional diplomacy – both deflationary and perhaps prolonging. For some, the swells of violence in 2011 serve as illustration of ASEAN’s failings. As one observer suggests, “Years of institutionalized interaction and enmeshment in a multilayered and multitracked web of cooperation failed to produce ‘restraining effects’ on members tempted to use force to settle differences, long an article of ASEAN faith” (Wain 2012: 39). Yet that the conflict did not escalate further is itself testament to the deflationary effect of regional diplomacy.

During the surge of violence in 2008, ASEAN failed to engage directly. Citing the norm of non-interference, there was a general apprehension to involve the organization (International Crisis Group, 2011: 14). Indonesia in particular, at the time a non-permanent member of the Security Council, sought to ensure this dispute remained regionally contained. As a member of the Indonesian delegation at the Council remarked,
the Indonesians as well as the Vietnamese, who were also on the Council, were “alarmed by the move” by Cambodia to approach the UN Security Council, via France, for assistance.\textsuperscript{104} The general feeling among ASEAN practitioners was that the swell of violence was a regional concern. In the words of the Indonesian official, such a conflict should lead to “talk amongst us” rather than bringing in “outsider partners.”\textsuperscript{105} The US delegation supported the Indonesian-led move by ASEAN, and the matter was not added to the Security Council agenda. ASEAN was left to pursue an intra-regional resolution. When the conflict escalated in February of 2011, member states acted to, again, halt the internationalization of the conflict and then to engage in a mediating diplomatic role. Interestingly, when the Council agreed on 14 February 2011 to hear the issue after waiting on Indonesian informal mediation, it decided to do so in a private meeting inviting the Thai, Cambodian, and Indonesian Foreign Ministers to engage in dialogue off the public record, and preempt the possibility of a legally binding resolution to emerge (International Crisis Group, 2011: 19-20). If ASEAN states were to engage another multilateral body, it would be, as one senior ASEC official noted, with the assumption that “we’ll deal with it, and we’ll do it our own way. But we don’t want to be stuck with too much on the legal side.”\textsuperscript{106} It was decided that an informal meeting would occur a week later in Jakarta among ASEAN foreign ministers, marking the first time the ministers had met to discuss an intra-ASEAN conflict and keeping the conflict within the region.

During this period, regional habits informed what was and was not done. Two potential options were off the table at the onset. Never was there a suggestion to use force to bring about a regional solution, nor was there a move to make use of the formal mechanisms provided for in the Charter and TAC. Member states attended an explicitly “informal” meeting of foreign ministers in Jakarta on 22 February (International Crisis Group, 2011: 21).

\textsuperscript{104} Interview with Indonesian official, Jakarta, July 23, 2014.
\textsuperscript{105} Interview with Indonesian official, Jakarta, July 23, 2014.
\textsuperscript{106} Interview with ASEC official, Jakarta, June 30, 2014.
For many regional practitioners this was a return to normalcy, and an efficacious one. As one official noted, returning the crisis to the region ensured that member states would “deal with it [ourselves] without having to embarrass anyone,” and thus face-saving would be possible.\textsuperscript{107} While Secretary General Surin Pitswan (\textit{Jakarta Post}, 2011) lauded this as the first time ASEAN had made formal use of “those [dispute resolution] mechanisms already in the charter,” in practice this is not entirely clear. Given the proclivities of practitioners, no formalized ASEAN High Council was convened. Rather, ASEAN diplomats set the modest aims of continued assurances utilizing informal dialogue. A senior ASEC official noted the common assumption was that a formal mechanism “has never worked. It has never worked because no one has really wanted to try it.” The prior consensus meant that procedurally, informal dialogue would be the only means to respond to this crisis. Noting the preference to engage in informality she continued, “within ASEAN you would never have that. Believe me, you’d never. Every time there is a dispute… you’ll never go [with a formal solution].”\textsuperscript{108}

Through this February meeting and a series of follow-up discussions, member states agreed that bilateral dialogue should be maintained between the two states, and that Indonesia would play a facilitatory role (International Crisis Group, 2011: 14). As an ASEC official remarked, Indonesia had the “ability to act and be accepted as acting on behalf of ASEAN” throughout the crisis.\textsuperscript{109} The conflict would remain firmly within the region, and within the bounds of what was assumed both normal and efficacious for regional practitioners. ASEAN would ‘do it our own way’ and ‘not be stuck with too much on the legal side.’

For some external observers this reality suggested that “hope placed in ASEAN’s dispute settlement mechanisms [was] proven to be disappointing” (Chachavalpongpun, 2013: 82). Given the habits of the region, however, faith in formal dispute settlement mechanisms was misplaced. As Gede Ngurah Swajaya, then Indonesian Permanent
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Representative to ASEAN, recalled of the 22 February impromptu ASEAN Foreign Ministers meeting in Jakarta,

They [attendees] stopped the exchange of fire and pushed them [Cambodian and Thai officials] to sit at the negotiating table… We’re not going to stick to the words and letters there in the agreement [the TAC]. So long as the objective is reached, the cessation of fire, and [we see] the coming back [of parties] to the negotiation table, then the objectives have already been achieved, right?\textsuperscript{110}

This view is mirrored by that of another official who took part in the talks: “At the meeting we were able to solve the problem [of the border dispute]. We were able to obtain assurances from both sides that any disputes would be resolved peacefully.”\textsuperscript{111}

Part of the solution stemmed from the Indonesian offer to provide observers to allay Cambodian fears and ensure the continuance informal dialogue. As the official recalled, “we declared to both sides that, if needed, Indonesia was willing to deploy a monitoring group along the border. The Foreign Ministry had selected a number of persons just in case we needed to deploy. But, with the political assurances from both sides – and it seems that both sides abided by the commitments – we became very much confident [they would not be needed].”\textsuperscript{112}

In these assessments, and for ASEAN practitioners more widely, the solution was the process of dialogue. This was the habitual disposition at work. This was not view of external observers, however. The International Crisis Group reacted pessimistically to the informalities, noting that “the ceasefires in place are mostly verbal and unsigned” and therefore “this conflict is not over” (International Crisis Group, 2011: i-ii).

At this stage there is a hint that regional habitual disposition pacified the parties, but may have also prolonged the crisis as they failed to formally resolve it. Indeed the ‘objective reached’ according to ASEAN officials seem at odds with external observers who recognized that the regional response did little to halt the potential of recurrent violence along the border. Indeed, during the following months of informal discussions tensions along the border again flared. The ‘objective reached’ through informal dialogue was not

\footnotesize{110} Interview with Ambassador Gede Ngurah Swajaya, Jakarta, July 30, 2014.
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sustained. While regional practitioners appeared satisfied with the coming to the table, this did little to actually halt violence.

In the two weeks leading up to and during the 3 May ASEAN Summit, large-scale clashes occurred yet again, displacing tens of thousands and killing 11 (International Crisis Group, 2011: 23-24). The Summit became the focal point for renewed ASEAN dialogue on the issue and an impromptu extra day of discussions was held between the Thai, Cambodian, and Indonesian ministers. Once again, the recourse was to informal dialogue and to keep the conflict contained within the region. These discussions produced yet more informal assurances on observations and the promise of continued dialogue. Ultimately, however, the ASEAN efforts championed by Indonesia came to little perceptible outcome. While ASEAN habits may have restrained the conflict, they did little to end it. Rather, ASEAN habits generated a practical tolerance to continued violence throughout the conflict and potentially prolonged the violence. Despite the view of ASEAN practitioners that they ‘solved’ the crisis, it was only with Cambodia’s break with regional habits and its successful internationalization of the crisis by turning to the ICJ that resolved the crisis in a formal sense. After the April violence Cambodia skirted the ASEAN process, breaking with what many observers saw as not only natural but also effective. As one ASEAN official suggested, there remained a shared belief that “We can do within ASEAN. So why don’t we just do within ASEAN?”113 This was not the view of the Cambodians by this stage. By applying to have the ICJ reinterpret the original 1962 judgment, and thus pursue international legitimacy for its claims outside the ASEAN informal processes, Cambodia again broke with habituated regional practice.

After three years of conflict and slow, ineffectual regional solutions, in July of 2011 the court rejected the Thai claims to the temple complex, provided Cambodia access, and compelled both parties to accept Indonesian monitoring over much of the disputed territory (International Crisis Group, 2011: 25-26). Troops were removed the following July in line with the demilitarization of the area (Fredrickson, 2012).

113 Interview with Indonesian official, Jakarta, July 23, 2014.
This episode illustrates the Southeast Asian habitual disposition at work, as well as its inherent limitations. Attention to regional habits does not suggest practitioners reacted unthinkingly to the crisis. Rather, practitioners’ thinking and behaviour were shaped by the habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations. As a result, the response was circumscribed in particular ways. In responding to the violent clashes among ASEAN members, Indonesia took a leading role. Its officials’ thinking and actions were guided by the habits of regional relations, and in large part assumed both natural and efficacious by other ASEAN practitioners, in line with particular understanding of abstract norms. There was an inherent and basic consensus among members that not only allowed Indonesia, as Chair, to take a leading role, but to maintain intra-regional mediation and the prospects of monitors. Throughout the crisis, member states demonstrated an automatic recourse to informal dialogue, abhorring the use of existing formal mechanisms of dispute settlement despite. Further, in large part this process of continued dialogue was assumed the end, rather than the means – however inefficacious this appeared to external observers.

Substantively, the regional reaction was informed by the practice of non-inference and certain a level of acceptance of the violence. There was no thought of a military solution, nor were there attempts to seek out blame for the crisis. Similarly, from the onset, practitioners sought to contain the crisis as a strictly intra-regional one, and within the region there would be no naming and shaming.

Moreover, this episode illustrates that, from an external standpoint, the Southeast Asian habitual disposition is not necessarily successful or optimal. While further counterfactual analysis would be required to explore the claim in detail, it is clear that the particular and slow ASEAN response did not, itself, halt violence along the broader, but may have made continued flares in violence possible by obviating the use of other means of resolution through the UNSC or ICJ at earlier stages. However, for regional practitioners, there remains belief that dialogue worked. As the officials above suggest, keeping parties at the table may have served to deescalate the crisis. Speaking in 2014 this was echoed by a number of Thai officials who, even after their loss at the ICJ, all shared the suggestion that Indonesia served as a useful “facilitator” during the crisis and that the talk enabled
“trust building.”

For external observers, on the other hand, ASEAN’s engagement was slow, ineffectual, and ultimately limited in its effect. As one European diplomat remarked half-jokingly, “the ‘ASEAN way’ works unless you have a temple on the border.”

Indeed, ASEAN practices did not resolve the crisis, and given the continued violence leading up the 2011 Summit, it may have prolonged it further. In this way, the habits of Southeast Asian relations serve to maintain a sustained, but thin level of conflict management. A basic and deflationary role is apparent, but so too is the potential that this habitual disposition lead to a prolonged crisis. The realities and limits of ASEAN cooperation are clear. This recourse to slow, ineffectual informal dialogue may thus inform the larger patterns of the conflictual peace of the region.

4.6 Conclusion

In this Chapter I have advanced three claims of decreasing scope. First, I have underscored the suggestion advanced in the preceding Chapter that the habitual and dispositional qualities of social relations not only undergird what social actors think from, but also delineate and pattern much of social action. More narrowly, I have argued that a focus on habitual dispositions offers a useful means to understand stability in complex social relations and more particularly, patterns of security cooperation. Second, I have argued that there exists a discrete set of habitual and dispositional qualities – a habitual disposition – shared among diplomatic practitioners in Southeast Asia. Non-interference within certain bounds, formal equality, and face-saving comprise the content of the habits with which regional practitioners confront both mundane regional relations and understand and responds to regional crises. In terms of process, habits rest on practices of prior consensus, informal dialogue and a privileging of process over formal outcome. Bridging these distinctions is a habituated recourse to informal pacific dispute settlement over formal or forceful intra-regional mechanisms. Third, I have argued that these dispositional traits limit and scope the “imaginability and thinkability” of security

114 Interview with Thai officials, Jakarta, July 1, 2014.
115 Interview with German official, Jakarta, July 17, 2014.
cooperation in Southeast Asia (Hopf, 2002: 283). While the ASEAN habitual disposition
exists and serves to limit conflict, this does not suggest the procedures and substantive
content deeply ingrained therein are efficient or optimal – at least from an external
perspective. As the Preah Vihear dispute makes clear, ASEAN may appear slow and
informal, and conflict may remain unresolved, however muted. Regional habits may
pacify but also protract conflict, and shape the long but conflictual regional peace here.
However, while regional practices may indeed be “strange” or “insane” in their
inefficaciousness to some external to the region, for regional practitioners themselves,
they simply ‘work’ and their self-evident effectiveness restricts the need to think about
alternative forms of practice. This habitual disposition, then, is an inherent and important
element of regional diplomacy in practice and a proximate cause of the pattern of peace
and conflict observed in the region.
Chapter 5.
Habits of Peace in South America

5.1 Introduction

The history of inter-state relations in South America presents another puzzle of peace and conflict. Since the 1940s, war has largely eluded the region and it has emerged an increasingly integrated one marked by dense organizational ties. However, militarized disputes have been and remain a pervasive feature of regional politics, territorial and boundary conflicts endure, and armed conflict remains a plausible means of solving disputes across much of the region. As Chapter 2 explored in greater detail, this is a recurrent reality of regional relations and yet while such militarized disputes remain relatively frequent, they rarely escalate to war. How can we understand this reality? What makes possible a proliferation of militarized disputes, absent escalation to war? How can we understand long peace and growing inter-state integration alongside violent territorial disputes?

Many regional scholars have recognized that sustained patterns of peace in the region have been made possible despite a lack of strong, unified states (Centeno, 2002; Mares, 2001) and absent the hallmarks of liberal democratic regions elsewhere (Kacowicz, 1998). Indeed, the regional peace remains particularly puzzling, and despite the illiberal and weak nature of many states, Centeno observes that since the turn of the 20th century an “inertia of peace” has sustained a pattern of pacific relations (2001: 263). As Holsti suggests, despite the potential for war, it remains “the most peaceful region in the world” (1996: 155). The core aim of this chapter is to explore the existence and effects of habits and dispositions here – those practical attributes of conflict management and regional relations more generally that inform this ‘inertia’, and that may circumscribe and continue to delineate state behaviour in the South American region and make possible the long conflictual regional peace. As with Chapter 4, I explore the foundation of the
As with Chapter 4, this Chapter is structured over three parts. First, I situate this study within two discussions. I offer a brief defense of a focus on the ‘region’ of South America. I then provide a short historical account of regional relations with attention centered on trends in peace and conflict to further situate my investigation. In the second section, I outline the habitual disposition of relations in the region. Here, again, I pay particular attention to the relationship between these deeply ingrained aspects of regional relations and the consciously referenced and codified norms of the region and beyond and rely on the specific interview-based methodology articulated in Chapter 3. The third section turns to the effect of this regional diplomatic habitual disposition. I do this first by reference to their assumed robustness among practitioners themselves, and, second, by tracing the effects of these habits in the long-standing territorial dispute between Peru and Ecuador.

5.2 Conflictual Regional Peace in South America

5.2.1 South America as a Region

South America is a region of twelve states: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Surinam, Uruguay, and Venezuela. United by geography, history, and the cultural, socio-economic and political linkages that stem there from, this grouping of states is often recognized as its own region within scholarship and in practice. However it is also of region of regions, and a region within regions.

These twelve states are situated within is a region within the larger Latin American region. Comprised of Central America and Mexico, this wider region shares many cultural and historical commonalities, as well as the contemporary manifestations of these commonalities through a number of organizations. For some observers, this wider region is a useful level of analysis to posit patterns of conflict and peace, and probe for
explanations. In studies of the wider Latin American region, however, the focus often rests primarily with the relations of South American states. In part, this animates the interest here. Kacowicz, for example, suggests that “Latin American countries, especially those in South America…have managed to establish a unique Latin ‘diplomatic culture’ that has helped their governments to resolve international conflicts short of war” (2005: 47; see also 1998: 103).

Broader, still, South America is a part of a hemispheric, or Pan-American region (although often to the exclusion of Canada in analyses). For example, David Mares (2001) recognizes a “security complex” within the wider Latin American region and inclusive of the United States as well. States here perceive the behaviours of other states as consequential and are interlinked by deep webs of bilateral and multilateral relations.

Within the South American ‘region’ there are other potential regions for analysis as well. A number of scholars who explore patterns of war and peace and diplomatic interactions parse South America into two geographic regions: the Southern Cone comprised of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay, and the Northern Tier states of Colombia, Guyana, Suriname, Venezuela, and perhaps the French enclave of Guiana (Kacowicz, 1998: 117-121; Hurrell, 1998). This distinction could be separated further still, given the patterns of regional relations among these states. For example, the states of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas (ALBA) represent a relatively coherent and unified geopolitical and social clustering of states defined largely as distinct from those of the Andean Community. As noted in Chapter 1, the lesson here is that regions are constructs with tangible and objective foundations, particularly geography, but they are also subjective.

This investigation focuses on South America to the exclusion of the wider and more narrow regional entities. As with any selection, this is a choice. Regions and relations overlap. However, the core reason for this choice is empirical. South America, as defined, offers a particularly stark puzzle. As Kacowicz notes, mirroring Holsti’s assertion above and the exploration in Chapter 2, South America “has been one of the most harmonious
regions in terms of absence of international wars” (1998: 68). This invites investigation. Further, as a subjective construct, the South American region has a particular cohesiveness that also invites exploration. This is clear from scholars like Holsti and Kacowicz who suggest a particular culture of relations here, and it was apparent in interviews with South American practitioners as well. South American practitioners assume themselves bound within a regional community and one related to but largely distinct from overlapping and more narrow regions of relations. While this subjectivity overlaps with both larger assumptions of identity such as being ‘Latin American’, and while it relates to more narrow ideational constructs as well (e.g. being a within or outside of ALBA), there is a South American identity perceptible across all interviews with regional practitioners.

With this choice in mind, there are a number of trends that are salient in examining the history of conflict and diplomacy among these states. I begin this Chapter by situating this study in the long history of the long and conflictual South American peace. A brief historical description of the long and conflictual peace founds the two core claims. First, and as explored in Chapter 3, habitual dispositions are historically rooted. In South America the assumptions and practices that characterize the regional field of diplomatic relations here emerged while regional states were in their infancy and were iterated and evolved through decades of 20th century regional relations. Through increasingly institutionalized channels, regional diplomatic habits serve to limit and diffuse regional conflicts. The ever growing and overlapping array of regional institutions that emerged in the nineteenth century, and proliferated further in the twentieth, makes possible the effects of habitual and dispositional qualities of relations. Second, it affords a description of the conflictual peace itself. While the region has been witness to pervasive levels of inter-state militarized disputes, war since at least 1941 has eluded the region.

**5.2.2 Regional History: Organizations and Violence**

In exploring patterns of conflict and cooperation in South America it is possible and useful to posit a number of distinct periods (see Kacowicz, 1998): a war-prone period
from the emergence of national states in the 1810s to the 1870s or early 1880s, a period of consolidation of states from the 1880s to 1919; the interwar period of 1920 to 1945 where depression and conflict characterized the region; the emergence of the postwar period characterized by US intervention, authoritarian politics, and inter-state rivalry from 1946 to the 1970s; and the current period of democratic development and resurgent ideological divides since the 1980s. In what follows, I briefly survey these periods to situate this case and to highlight the reality of both pervasive regional conflict and the ideational and institutional developments across each period.

The emergent states of South America achieved independence and defined their borders violently, with 15 years of war between the states and Spain (1810-1824), followed by more than 50 years of regional conflict within and between them. From the 1830s to the 1880s war was frequent, and often devastating. Alongside pervasive minor territorial conflicts, six major regional wars occurred during this period, including the First Argentine-Brazilin War (1825-28), the Peru-Gran Colombia War (1828-29), the War of the Peruvian-Bolivarian Confederation (1836-39), and the War of the Pacific (1879-1883) between Chile and Peru in opposition to Bolivia (see Kacowicz, 1998: 71-72). Of particular severity was the La Guerra Grande (1836-1852), a monumental war with a series of conflicts between Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil, and saw external interventions from both France and the United Kingdom. Similarly, the War of the Triple Alliance (1865-1870) saw Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay against Paraguay, in a particularly disastrous conflict that left more than 200,000 Paraguayan soldiers dead. In short, the period from independence to the 1890s was characterized by a zone of war and conflict among emergent states as they established their borders.

With the conclusion of the War of the Pacific, however, the region embarked on a more peaceful trajectory where war quickly became the exception and not the rule. As these states both consolidated their national authority and grew in economic power, a relative balance of power emerged to deter conflicts that may otherwise have risked a return to large scale war (Dominguez et al., 2003). As the nineteenth century concluded, Argentina emerged as a major and increasingly consolidated state power and joined Peru, Chile and
Brazil as major economic and military powers in the region in relative balanced (see Burr 1955; 1965; Dominguez et al., 2003). Kacowicz, for example, recognizes this periods as a kind of “ABC [Argentina, Brazil, Chile] Concert” (1998: 72-73). Therein, major states consolidated not only internal power, but their external relations and zones of influence as well, and as explored in Chapter 2, many observers recognize the constraining power of this balance of power in the emergence of a stable peace in the region during this period.

Inter-state conflict, however, did not disappear with the conclusion of the century nor the emergence of relative power balances. Argentina and Chile, for example, nearly came to war in both 1898 and 1901 over unresolved border demarcations in the Andes, and a formal peace between Chile and Bolivia was not concluded until 1904. Peru and Ecuador saw sustained military skirmishes along their disputed border from 1900 to 1904, which lead to failed arbitration by the Spanish King in 1906 (see Mares, 2001: 162-163). While war and conflict characterized the first five decades of South American independence, it is clear that during the violent period of independence and its emergent peace in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the kernel of institutional and ideational means of restraint and cooperation existed. As Kacowicz observes of this period of violence, “the entire period the new states entertained a lingering spirit of solidarity” (1998: 72). This commonly held ‘spirit’ is apparent too, as Centeno (2002: 86-87) suggests, given that there has been little “demonization” of states in conflict nor national celebration at the conclusion of wars. Rather, there is an assumption of war as an aberration and detrimental to regional development.

From this common assumption if basic assumption community stemmed a core a legal principle of *uti possidetis juris*, that states had the right to maintain its colonial territorial boundaries. As Jorge Dominguez and his coauthors observe, “To be sure, considerable postcolonial warfare surfaced in the aftermath of the breakdown of the Spanish empire, some of it affected by unclear boundaries. Yet the inherited administrative boundaries were sufficiently respected in practice in South America to contribute to the process of securing early on a framework of domestic and international legitimacy in the otherwise
bloody passage from the Spanish empire to its successor American states” (2003: 21). However, this lingering solidarity and ideational commonality had little effect until the emergence of a relatively stable balance of power at the end of the twentieth century.117

The inter-war years saw a return to major conflict. The limited peace of the consolidation period was broken by the Chaco War of 1932-35 and the Ecuador-Peru War of 1941, as well as a series of lesser conflicts involving Peru and Colombia (see Centeno, 2002: 89-90). The Chaco War was particularly violent. As Jones observes of the combatants, “To the fullest extent that their resources allowed, they reenacted World War I, with trench warfare and aerial bombardments as essential elements of conflict” (1991: 138). While Ecuador-Peruvian conflict concluded in the same year it began, it risked wider escalation to a regional conflict given support from neighbouring states for the belligerents. During the conflict mediation efforts from the US, Argentina, Brazil and Chile lead to a series of negotiations that produced the Protocol of Peace, Friendship, and Boundaries between Peru and Ecuador or Rio Protocol. This agreement recognized Peruvian sovereignty over the disputed territory and a further 8,000 square kilometers, costing Ecuador two thirds of its Oriente Province and its only outlet to the Amazon River (see Kacowicz, 1998: 77; Mares 2001: 34). The enmity between the states over the territory persisted, and would shape relations between the two states and beyond until the turn of the twenty-first century.118 Lesser conflicts arose between Peru and Colombia during this period as well, including Peru’s seizure of Colombian territory in Leticia Trapezium, and a series of military skirmishes in 1933 (see Kacowicz, 1998: 77). Ultimately, these disputes were managed by the League of Nations and mediation efforts from the United States and Brazil.

116 While there were a number of exceptions to this in the periods that followed (see Dominguez et al., 2003, 21-22), there have been none since 1941.
117 In many ways this mirrors the more global “territorial integrity norm” (Zacher, 2001), but arrived in South America much earlier. Dominguez et al. (2003: 25) make a similar claim (see also Herz and Nogueira 2002: 22-25). On how this common and foundational normative quality informed the management of territorial disputes see Jackson (2000: 327).
118 Ecuador formally rejected the Protocol in 1960, leading to a series of armed conflicts including the brief conflict in 1981 occasionally referred to as the Paquisha War, and the larger Cenepa “War” of 1995 explored in this chapter.
It was US mediation, in particular, which emerged as a continual feature of regional conflict in the interwar years (see Mares, 2016). Under the American Good Neighbour Policy, heralded by President Roosevelt, the region saw increased American involvement in regional conflicts, particularly within the Southern Cone (see Whitaker, 1976: 373-379). This was clear through efforts to mediate both the Chaco War in 1932 and the 1941 Marañón or Zarumilla dispute (see Martin, 2006: 85-91). US intervention in such regional disputes, however, was sporadic. Moreover, it was largely centered on facilitating mediation rather than intervention directly within conflicts. While direct military intervention characterized US behaviour in Central America and the Caribbean from the 1890 First Inter-American Conference to the 1933 introduction of the Good Neighbour Policy, in South America its interventionist inclinations were expressed largely through rhetorical condemnation of violence and by diplomatic engagement at the request of – and often alongside – regional states and was largely absent coercion or authoritative intimidation (see Martin, 2006: 84-86; Wood 1966).

At the same time, however, there were continual South American and wider hemispheric and Latin American attempts to mitigate conflict in the layered regions, and maintain a region of peaceful conflict resolution (see Varas, 1983). In 1902 Argentina, Brazil, and Chile signed the so-called “Pactos de Mayo” which compelled previously ordered Argentine and Chilean naval ships to be re-sold to Japan and the UK, respectively. In 1923, Latin American Foreign Ministers agreed prevent regional armed conflict among states, and repeated a similar declaration during the 1936 Conference on Peace Consolidation. Within the broader inter-American system, too, states pledged not to use force to settle disputes in both the 1947 Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty and the Bogota Pact of 1938.119

In the post-war period two potentially divergent trends are apparent: the rise of an increasingly dense institutionalization of regional relations in South America and the

119 During the height of the Cold War in 1969, this took on a particular non-aligned tinge, with the South American pledge to maintain itself as a “zone of peace” similar to the Southeast Asian pledge in 1976 (Mares 2001: 47; Varas 1992). This was repeated in 2002 by the South American Presidents (see UN 2002) as well as in 2003 through the OAS (OAS 2003) and in 2014 through CELAC (see World Peace Council 2014).
wider region of which it is part, and the rise of authoritarian regimes with distinct geopolitical national security interests (see Kacowicz 1998; Varas 1983). Both of these developments further informed the ideational and institutional structure of regional relations, with the result being a strengthening of these increasingly habitual ideational and institutional realities (see Dominguez et al., 2003: 22).

In particular, American efforts to construct a hemispheric architecture for diplomatic relations were driven by a perceived need for a bulwark against the threat of communism, and materialized with the hemispheric Organization of American States (OAS) in 1948 and its Charter (see OAS 1948). Latin and South American state involvement in this Pan-American system, however, was largely driven by an interest in promoting economic growth. From the 1950s and 1960s onwards South American states pursued a network of often overlapping institutional and integrationist measures in pursuit of this interest (Riggirozzi 2012; 20-25). Chief among these was the 1960 Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), established to foster greater economic interconnectedness and development within Mexico and six South American states (Riggirozzi, 2012: 21). For many, this is seen as the “first serious effort to promote regional integration” in the Americas (Malamud and Schmitter, 2006/7: 13). Similarly, in 1969 Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Colombia, and Bolivia signed the Treaty of Cartagena establishing the Andean Pact, a customs union, which evolved into the wider Andean Community (CAN) in 1996. The grouping was in many ways more expansive than the LAFTA that preceded it, incorporating supra-national political institutions, the Commission and Junta, and it signaled a sub-regional integrationist project that remains impactful today despite the abandonment of its original integration plans (Malamud and Schmitter 2006/7: 13; Mace 1988). In the same year, 1996, the La Plata Basin Group or Cuenca del Plata was formed by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay to pursue the development of common hydroelectric power and water resources. In sum, this period saw a blossoming of regional initiatives and the field of diplomatic interaction was increasingly institutionalized.

---

120 This would be later transformed into the Latin American Integration Association (LAIA) in 1980, and largely served the same purpose.
However, alongside this emerging and increasingly dense institutionalization of regional cooperation, South American states experienced sustained levels of regional conflict. Of particular consequence was the 1978 the Beagle Channel Dispute between Argentina and Chile over the disputed territory of the channel, and an episode worth exploring in brief.

The divisive territorial claims over the channel were of importance for both states: securing the channel would make Chile both a Pacific and Atlantic naval power and provide access to potential oil resources, while its loss for Argentina would mean restricted access to the South Atlantic, a threat to the junta’s interest in hegemony over the western South Atlantic and its domestic political support. Since 1971, the British Queen Elizabeth II had been the recognized arbiter of the dispute by both of these political and ideologically adversaries – at the time, Allende led a socialist-communist coalition in Chile, while General Lanusse led a military dictatorship in Argentina (see Domínguez et al. 2003: 27). In June of 1977 the Pinochet dictatorship was awarded the territory by decree from the United Kingdom. This decision was rejected by Argentina in January of 1978, and a vitriolic propaganda campaign and active military show of force from both sides followed. One aircraft carrier, two cruisers, seven destroyers and two Argentinian submarines were dispatched to the area and met by a Chilean fleet of three cruisers, eight frigates and destroyers, and three submarines. A general mobilization by both states along their border was ordered. Further, both sides sought military and other support from other regional states. Argentina requested a Peruvian invasion of Chile’s north and Bolivia considered an attack on Chile as well, with the aim of regaining access to the Pacific (Holsti 1996: 159). While neither state ultimately entered the conflict, Peru did order a partial mobilization and thus further escalated the now potential regional crisis, risking a larger region-wide war (see Kacowicz 2000: 89; Holsti 1996: 158-159). In turn, Chile requested Ecuador to end oil exports to Peru. This was a potentially explosive crisis that threatened to escalate well beyond the large show of force. The reaction of regional states was circumscribed by their particular and habitual legalism.
Mediation in search of formal resolution of the crisis came from recourse to the established and legalistic practices of de-escalation in the region, and made possible, perhaps, by serendipity. Indeed, Holsti notes the puzzling dynamics of Argentina’s search for arbitration of the dispute (1996: 155-156; 158-160). After four tense days, a violent storm forced the battle groups apart and made possible a pause in rising escalations. During this pause, Pope John Paul II personally offered to arbitrate the dispute by directly appealing to leaders in both states. This, now second, turn to formal arbitration by an authority external to the region was accepted by both states. Practitioners knew the tense standoff, however risky, could and would not lead to war once resolution was pursued – there was an inherent presumption of pacific dispute resolution here. Practitioner thinking was couched in deep and firm legalism in this regard. As a Chilean interviewee recalled of this period, “nobody wanted a war with Argentina. They could not afford a war with Argentina! And the other side did not want war either.” However, it was clear that want it or not, as another Chilean diplomat recalled, “we were on the edge of war once again.” However risky this standoff had become, however, regional leaders were restrained in their thinking and their action. After foreign mediation, the crisis was finally and formally resolved six years later with the 1984 Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation and the Argentinian plebiscite to accept the loss of the Islands (Domínguez et al., 2003: 32).

As Holsti observes of the crisis more generally, the “conflict was characterized by many in both Chile and Argentina in terms of obligations arising from nineteenth century treaties and standard legal practices in locating sea and other territorial boundaries” (1996: 89). This meant, as Holsti continues, that this particular brand of legalism was the “intellectual milieu” in which decisions were made during the crisis. There was indeed an automatic “propensity for law,” as one American official recognized decades later. Thinking from this dispositional tendency towards regional legalism and the obligation inherent therein, both sides accepted external arbitration. Despite the risks of the standoff, escalation beyond a show of force was mute. In this account, an active recourse to established and legalist practices served to maintain regional peace. Only with the

---

121 As in previous chapters, interviewees here are generally anonymous and referred to using alternating male and female pronouns. All interviews referenced in this chapter were conducted in Washington, DC in September and October of 2014 and all were conducted in English.
existence of the dispositional and habitual recourse, then, could Kacowicz conclude that this conflict “did not disturb the pre-existing fragile peace in general terms” (2000: 89; see also Tulchin, 1990: 146). Limited violence is tolerated within the region, and the habitual sources of crisis response circumscribe behaviour. A similar conclusion can be reached regarding the resurgence of the Peru-Ecuador territorial dispute which manifested yet again with a militarized confrontation and a series of skirmishes in 1981, killing as many as 200 soldiers.

As Kacowicz concludes, “This was a particularly dangerous period in which the regional peace was at least precarious, and war remained a real possibility” (1998: 80). Tensions were further heightened by a common rise in authoritarian politics across the region. The arms race between Brazil and Argentina was just one aspect of this trend, which saw both develop indigenous nuclear technologies (Martin, 2006: 62; Serrano, 1994), and speaks to wider antagonisms between the two regional powers. For some observers, the probability of war between these states “was not only highly, but to a large extent, imminent throughout this period” (Battalingo, 2012: 141). At the same time, however, regional institutionalization continued, particularly in the wake of the lost decade of the debt crisis and the return of democracy to the region (Haggard and Kaufman, 1992; Fanelli, 2003).

With the exceptions of Paraguay and Chile, which democratized in 1992 and 1989 respectively, the 1970s and early 1980s was a period of regional democratization. As a Paraguayan official suggested, “There are many countries that have come out of the same systems as with Paraguay, like Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, Peru… it is the same experience.” This common democratic development has been linked to deepening and sustained economic interrelations (Battaglino, 2012: 141-142) and the growth of a sense of ‘friendship’ alongside the de-securitization of regional relations (Oelsner, 2007). Particularly within the South Cone states of Argentina, Brazil and Chile the return of democracy and the related and growing economic integration made possible a settling of their long standing territorial disputes and thus deeper and more institutionalization foundation for pacific relations (see Battaglino, 2012 and Buzan and Weaver, 2003: 322-327). This is evidenced most clearly by the end of the period of arms race and rivalry
between Argentina which transitioned to democracy in 1983, and Brazil which transitioned to democracy in 1985. While the rivalry had been mediated and rapprochement begun under authoritarian rule, the stability of relations improved markedly after democratization. Most tellingly, perhaps, was the establishment in 1997 of *Mecanismo de Consulta y Coordinación entre Brasil y Argentina en materia de Defensa y Seguridad Internacional* or the Brazilian-Argentine Consultation and Coordination Mechanism for International Security and Defense Issues (MCC), which provides a forum within which to pursue common security issues (see Flemes, 2005: 13).

However, the relationship between the return of democracy and the pattern of regional conflict is not a clearly linear one as democratic developments seem to have stoked tensions and lead to increases in violence in a number of cases (see Domínguez et al., 2003). For example, given popular revisionist interests, the transition to democracy may have actually increased the likelihood of escalation in the enduring territorial dispute between Peru and Ecuador over access to the Amazon River in the 1990s (Mares, 2001: 161-189; Varas, 1983: 76). So, while this development between the traditional and major power rivals of Argentina and Brazil exemplifies the institutionalization of cooperative means of conflict resolution, and suggests a qualitative change in their relations (Kacowicz, 1998: 98-99; Battaglino, 2012: 141-145), in the wider context of the region these changes did little to diminish the pervasive level of territorial disputes, and not expanded into a larger regional security community (Mares, 2001; Morris and Millan, 1983). However, these did developments did foster increased and enduring economic cooperation.

Mercosur, the Common Market of the South, comprised of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay was created through the Treaty of Asunción in 1991 as an effort to promote domestic social welfare through regional cooperation, and further institutionalized in 1994 through the Protocol of Ouro Preto (Malamud and Schmitter, 2006/7: 14). Similarly, during this period the Andean Pact grew to a more formalized and ambitious Andean Community (see Malamud and Schmitter, 2006/7). An alternative form of cooperation also emerged in the form of ALBA. Established in 2004 by Cuba and
Venezuela, the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America, includes 11 states from the wider Latin American and Caribbean regions, including Venezuela, Bolivia, and Ecuador in South America, and offers a rival model to the liberal economic integrationist impulses of Mercosur and the Andean Pact (Riggiorozzi, 2012: 25-29).

More recently, and more expansively, the founding of Union of South American States (UNASUR) signaled a largely Brazilian-led and exclusively South American integrationist strategy encompassing existing economic agreements and promoting a wider and rival attempt at political integration (see Gurzan, 2010: 27). While the organization remains largely in development, having only been formalized in 2008 and with its Secretariat still under construction in 2014 – a “baby” organization according to two South American interviewees – it denotes a particular and overlapping vision of South American regionalism and largely in opposition to both the American-dominated OAS and the Chavismo-inspired ABLA (see Riggirozzi, 2012: 29-31). Similarly, the Council of South American Defense (SADC), formed in 2009, unites the ministries of defense of UNASUR members to jointly pursue the realization of a zone of peace, to the exclusion of the US-influenced OAS (see Battaglino, 2012). At the same time, however the South American region has also embarked on a political economic ‘community’ with the wider Community of Latin American and Caribbean States founded in 2010 to present an alternative forum from the OAS. These organizations, still in their infancy, further underscore the regional history of myriad often overlapping organizations. As an Ecuadorian official noted with some dismissal:

…we have CELAC and we have UNASUR [besides the OAS]. Right? In those two integration groups, we don’t have the United States and Canada, and in the UNASUR we don’t have Mexico… but we don’t know [how consequential they are or will be]. We will see in the coming future what we will get from them. They are just buildings now. They are being built and are developing now. Usually, it starts with a political boom. Someone comes and gives an initial push to integration or whatever, and it grows a little bit. Then we wait five or maybe seven years to see it continue growing. Then it will develop into something else, but we don’t know.123

---

122 Interview with two Argentinian officials, Washington, November 6, 2014.
123 Interview with two Ecuadorian officials, Washington, November 7, 2014.
One OAS official suggested a similar level of hesitation regarding these recent developments: “Regionalism has a long history [in South America], and I think it’s positive. I think the jury is somewhat still out on UNASUR and CELAC, which are pretty recent organizations. We’re in a process… [so it] is not wise to reach hasty conclusions [on UNASUR or CELAC].”¹²⁴ In short, these developments, both democratic and institutional, have not ensured the resolution of regional territorial conflicts, nor have they generated a sense of wider regional identity that abhors violence as a means to affect change.

There are two trends that can be drawn from this survey of regional relations and conflict. First, the history South American relations shows a violent region. While war has eluded the region since at least 1941, regional states have engaged in persistent conflicts short of war. Second, alongside this conflictual peace has been the development of ideas, institutions, and diverse and overlapping organizational mechanisms for cooperation that suggest a basic regional community. The “ubiquity of the use of force in interstate relations” in this region (Mares, 2001: 47) seems matched by a ubiquity in regional organizations and in the regional norms and principles that underpin them. In what follows, I unearth a set of discrete cognitive and behavioural habits from within this regional community, and query how or if they shape the practice of regional conflict management and cooperation more generally.

5.3 Habits of Regional Relations in South America

Given the overlapping organizations, shared ideas, and collective regional experience, many scholars have recognized distinctive and shared inter-state norms within the South American region. In a number of accounts, these norms serve to guide the relations of South American states and have assisted with defusing conflict and generating cooperative relations at a foundational level (e.g. Kacowicz, 2005; Tussie, 2009). Many accounts of regional norms recognize that South American relations display a particular

and legalistic “diplomatic culture” – a unique set of legal principles that state practitioners rely upon in their decision-making (Holtsi, 1996: 17). As Kacowicz summarizes of the wider Latin American region, “In few other parts of the world is the culture of a given region perceived to be so distinctive, identifiable, and at the same time so influential in the political processes, both domestic and international” (2005: 47). Since their independence, South American states “have gradually built a highly developed system of regional international law” that has constrained behaviour through conscious reference to a set of legal norms (Kacowicz, 2005: 46). This is a useful entry point to exploring what, if any, qualities of regional relations are dispositional and habitual, and thereby may be of particular significance for understanding conflict management patterns at the heart of regional long and conflictual peace.

Surveying the literature on South American norms produces a wide array of consciously referenced codified norms and principles. These include (1) sovereignty and equality of states; (2) uti possidetis juris and territorial integrity; (3) peaceful settlement of international disputes, convivencia, and concertacion; (4) arms control, collective security and; (5) confidence-building measures; and political legalism, democracy, and human rights (see Kacowicz, 2005: 59-63; 50-51). These have been foundational for both South American declarations the Constitutive Treaty of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) of 2008, and within the wider Pan-American framework as well, most notably in the 1948 OAS Charter.

In what follows, I argue that many of these normative qualities of relations are better understood through the lens of practice and habit – as deeply internalized and dispositional qualities of relations that provide for unproblematic and relatively automatic behaviour within a particular community of practitioners. It is the particular and largely unreflexive practice of many of these codified and often abstract norms that shapes

---

125 Again, while Kacowicz surveys the Latin American region he finds a normative or cultural community particularly stark and consequential in South America (2005: 47).
126 In applying and examining the link between the existence of these consciously referenced and often codified norms and long regional peace, Kacowicz focuses his efforts on investigating the origins and impact of the norm of peaceful settlements of disputes and that of uti possidetis juris (see 2005: 71-77).
regional relations among South American states. Before I uncover the particular qualities of regional relations, I pause to comment on their origins.

**5.3.1 A comment on the origins of habits in South America**

Habitual dispositions emerge from precedent and iteration, are shaped and propagated by the behaviour of powerful actions, and conditioned by perceptions of efficacy within a community or field of practitioners. As with the previous chapter, the aim here is not to offer a full analysis of the emergence and development of diplomatic habits of the region. Rather, I wish only to suggest that regional habits here, too, emerged through the culturally-specific practices of regional states and have been transmitted within the bounds of the dense institutionalized context of the South American region as explored.

The particularities of the legal and normative tradition of South American states has been long recognized by many scholars with varied analytical interests. For example, Anderson observed the role of common experience across the ‘creole elites’ of emergent nation-states of the region as the foundational for uniting not only disparate national entities, but for building a common and Iberian-styled framework of regional relations (Anderson, 2006: 53-59). Kacowicz explores these suggestions more directly in reference to regional cooperation, were he suggests they lie in the “Spanish legalistic culture, including its features of idealism, paternalism, legalism, and formalism” shape the South American norms of sovereignty and equality of states, *uti possidentis*, and political legalism (2005: 54-55). However, the long-held legal traditions of the emergent states of South America have been impacted, of course, by wider experiences with Bolivarianism and Pan-Americanism. While the origins of the habitual qualities of regional relations rest with this common experience, it is their practice by powerful regional states that has reified and rendered them consequential for relations.

Here, Brazil looms large in both across history and in terms of the views of regional officials today. A Peruvian official noted succinctly that “Brazil is the largest and most
“powerful” regional state. A Paraguayan official suggested much the same, noting that Brazil is “a big country. A powerful country.” As a result, as a Colombian official reflected, “it is clear they want to be the regional power; to be like the United States in South America... regardless of leftist, centrist or right-leaning governments. It is a path in their history.” This, of course, does not suggest a hegemonic imposition of Brazilian authority and interests – in the region, in the OAS, or through other regional organizations such as UNASUR. This was clearly recognized by many interviewees with experience across both political (OAS, UNASUR) and economic (Mercosur) institutions in South America. As a Peruvian official summarized with contemplative hesitation, “Brazil thinks they are the leader [of the region]… to a certain point they are so, of course… But, they are not fully.” However, it does suggest that attention to Brazilian behaviour in the long history of the long and conflictual peace may be more consequential for the shape of habits of peace and cooperation than others.

Unsurprisingly, Brazilian diplomats recognize this reality as well. As one official remarked of his South American colleagues at the OAS: “They say that ‘Brazil is a leader, a natural leader in the region, so we need you to lead this process or to go ahead and bring some ideas.’ They need the presence of Brazil in some way. [But] I don’t want to brag about it.” Recognizing the flipside of this assumption, the Brazilian official suggested pragmatically, “Of course, you hear complaints from Paraguay and Uruguay, but I think that’s the natural way that things are. You will always hear the complaints of smaller countries about bigger countries.” As she continued, “I remember when I served in [small South American state redacted to ensure anonymity]. Sometimes I was really surprised when I opened the newspaper and saw: ‘Brazil is an imperialist country that is stealing everything from [redacted].’ Now, I say to my American friends here that I understood the US much more after being in [redacted]!”

128 Interview with Paraguayan official, Washington, October 28, 2014
129 Interview with Colombian official, Washington, November 14, 2014.
131 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
Speaking to officials external to the region serves to further shed light on this dynamic as well. One North American official, with a distinct sense of vitriol, noted that “They are the puppet masters. But you can never say where or how it [Brazilian power and leadership] works. It just is. Whenever we have a real breakdown in negotiations [with South American states at the OAS], at the end of the day, we need them.”

Finally, beyond common cultural historical experience and the presence of powerful regional states, it is clear that region exhibits the institutions in which particular practices and habits are likely to emerge. The dense, overlapping organizational architecture of regional relations suggests sustained interaction among regional diplomats and, as the OAS exhibits, a relatively insular trans-national and trans-organizational field of diplomatic practitioners.

In short, the field of regional practice appears the kind of context in which habituated practices and unthinking patterns of action are likely to emerge and impact relations.

132 Interview with North American official at the OAS, Washington, October 30, 2014. While it is beyond the scope of interest here, it is clear that this Brazilian regional leadership manifests itself in a spoiler role at the OAS. Here, their regional leadership is diluted and other important players – the US, Mexico – also exercise particular sway. As a result, Brazil actively undermines OAS efforts at times, and consistently is disengaged in the organization’s operations. As a Peruvian official observed, “They are not even the chair of a single group [at the OAS]. They don’t even try.” At the OAS this often means Brazil is the source of impasse. A Peruvian diplomat (Interview, Washington, November 3, 2014) suggested

   It’s because Brazil is not the guy here. They cannot control it here. There is Mexico and the US, especially the US, but Canada too. They have less influence here, so why would they want this [the OAS] to be any stronger? They want UNASUR to be the strongest one. That is their political, and their most important regional, forum. Well, Mercosur, but I think UNASUR is probably more important. Here, they cannot manage everything as they can manage it in UNASUR where is hard to balance them. I think that’s why they don’t really support it, and the ABLA countries are the same. But that’s also why we do support it, and we do care – we do support the OAS.

An American diplomat at the OAS, with experience elsewhere in the South American region, was less convinced. In her view, Brazil has “a tremendous amount of political power but they cannot make good on this potential” at the OAS or through UNASUR. In her view, Brazil is “like a teenager. They want all the privileges [of being a powerful state] and brush aside any responsibility” (Interview, Washington, November 12, 2014). Thus, when Brazil recently sought a seat on the UN Security Council, and established the “baby” institution that is the UNASUR while continuing to stymie progress at the OAS, it is because “are hedging their bets. As a teen, they know they can be bizarre and disinterested, but won’t be kicked out of the house… and yet they don’t want to leave either.” This suggestion is that while Brazil wishes to be an active and powerful member of the regional, hemispheric, and even global community, for this American observer it is not yet acting as a powerful state should. This was echoed by a North American-born OAS official who suggested that “Brazil is big. Brazil is important” but it is not a “constructive, mature” member state (Interview with OAS official, November 13, 2014).
Again, and as has been explored in Chapter 3, there are important distinctions between the norms, principles and rules noted in such official channels and those habituated in practice. Which, if any, of these norms and institutional principles have emerged has habitual and disposition, and what if any is the effect on the long history of regional relations?

5.4 The Existence of a South American Habitual Disposition

South American regional diplomatic practitioners think about regional relations from a particular and legalist foundation to the exclusion of any others. Here, relations begin with a disposition towards legalism rather than informal processes, and four related habitual qualities can be unpacked. In terms of process, regional relations are shaped by a rules-based orientation, formality in dialogue, and the propensity towards external mediation of disputes. These processual attributes of inter-state relations rest on a fourth element of habitual content, the inarticulate sense of regional familiarity that defines the community of practitioners absent the we-ness apparent in other pacific regions. Each of these qualities of regional relations is deeply internalized, and circumscribes the behaviour of regional practitioners, thereby informing regional relations. I explore the claims in turn, beginning with an exposition of these four habitual qualities of regional relations.

5.4.1 Habituated Process

South American diplomacy rests on a legalistic foundations and assumptions of natural and efficacious processes. In some ways, this claim is not a novel one. Many scholars have recognized the long history of legalism in the region and explored the consciously referenced norms which seem to have shaped regional relations. As Holsti notes, “South American governments have frequently – and uniquely – chosen legal means for defusing actual or potential crises. There has also been a history of policy-makers analyzing issues from a legal rather than geostrategic perspective” (1996: 170). However, as Andrew
Hurrell observes, legalism is “one of the most overused and under-analyzed concepts in relation to the foreign policies of the Americas” (2004: 5). In particular, a focus on rhetoric over practice has obscured an understanding of how practitioners themselves understand and practice “legalism” in terms of political-security cooperation.

As made clear in Chapter 3, the distance between codified, often abstract norms and practice is often a wide one. As Hurrell continues, “It might be the case, for example, that law has been very important in the background of many elites in Latin America; but this has often been divorced from the actual practice or influence of law” (2004: 5).

Kacowicz suggests much the same regarding the wider normative framework he uncovers in the wider Latin American context, casting doubt as to whether consciously referenced norms of appropriate conduct inform behaviour in practice (see 2005: 72). This recalls Acharya’s noted concession that the norms of the ASEAN way may not inform ASEAN behaviour (2014: 62). Indeed, this is the precisely the interest of my focus on habit in the context of South American relations: to examine the background thinking and the particular practices that undergird regional relations. Exploring and conceptualizing the practices and understandings of this diplomatic culture of “legalism” through the lens of habit and practice puts the onus of definition on the practitioners themselves, and what practices unfold from their particular and unthinking existence within a community of regional states.

What regional practitioners understand of a recourse to the self-evident or “normal way”133 that diplomacy and regional relations work – and what and how legalism is understood therein – is particular and distinctively South American. South American practitioners think and act from a particular and habitual foundation. In practice, legalism means particular things to South American practitioners and they think from a specific and often inarticulate knowledge of what this means and how it informs action. In particular, there are two related qualities that undergird the process of regional relations: thinking from a rules-oriented foundation for interactions, and engaging in
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133 Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
formalized dialogue. From these underlying foundations, stems the third processual attribute, a turn to external mediation of regional disputes.

In speaking to South American diplomats, it is clear that they think from a rules-oriented-approach to relations, and rely on formalized dialogue as the core means to address regional issues. There is a common and unproblematized assumption that legal principles and rules-oriented processes are the means for regional relations. This was made clear when speaking to a Chilean diplomat who after discussing his approach to regional problems through the OAS and beyond, seemed puzzled at the suggestion of informality and described his working life as “quite simply, very rule-oriented” and “legalistic.” A Peruvian official echoed this by suggesting the legalism her colleagues had noted was “how it is that we approach problems.” These suggestions were mirrored by the observations of many diplomats external to the region who work alongside South American officials. In the words of an American diplomat working closely with regional practitioners, the South Americans practice a unique and “heavy legalism,” and one that shapes all her interactions with her South American colleagues. These quick suggestions typify the South American approach to both regionalism more generally, and dispute resolution in particular: a heavily legalism in practice and a rules-oriented disposition.

In many conversations it was made clear that a rules-oriented foundation and formality in dialogue was the ‘only game in town’. Many noted the recourse to formal channels for dispute resolution – from economic to military – provided a sense of naturalness and comfort. In the words of a Chilean diplomat, formality was a means for his state to “feel safe and comfortable.” As he continued, “We [South American states] are small counties. We always support legalistic approaches because of our backyard. The US likes to say we are its backyard, but it is ours too. We need clear and established rules to be protected.” A Peruvian diplomat echoed this sentiment when he suggested that adopting

134 Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
136 Interview with American official, Washington, November 12, 2014.
137 Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
rules-oriented dialogue meant an “an extra guarantee” of their interests and one that facilitated stable regional relations.\textsuperscript{138} In the words of the Chilean official, “the weight of history is too heavy” to stray from safe and comfortable legalism.\textsuperscript{139}

An illustration of this reality in the fall of 2014 was the recent experience reforming the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR). This was a common theme raised by South American practitioners when asked to describe their recent efforts at the OAS, as it undercut both the division within the South American region and preoccupied many states while working at the OAS. The impulse for reform came from Brazil, who had run afoul of the Commission in recent years as a result of its Belo Monte hydroelectric dam construction, and from the ALBA states who saw it as a imposition of American power more widely. As one Brazilian official suggested, “we have had to take a lead in one of the most important processes that we have here: the one related to the reform of the human rights system. But [we’ve] had to be very careful because this was the issue that made Brazil go away, in such a sense, from the OAS. It was an important issue for us, but [our efforts] couldn’t be so conspicuous so that people would think we were trying to get our revenge or were trying to impose on the Inter-American System.”\textsuperscript{140} For Brazilians, and the ALBA states alike, there was a common tread in interviews that, as this Brazilian official suggested, “the decisions taken by the Commission were subjective and that they depended on the person who was in charge of the proceedings.”\textsuperscript{141} This informality was not how normal relations should work.

\textsuperscript{138} Interview with Peruvian official, Washington, November 3, 2014.
\textsuperscript{139} Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
\textsuperscript{140} Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014. In 2011 in response to the request of the IAHCR that Brazil stop work on the dam, Brazilian President Rouseff formally pulled its ambassador from the OAS, leaving their permanent representative an apparently permanent interim figure, a symbolic move matched in more practical terms by a pause in paying dues and a refusal to support the OAS by chairing working groups. See “PM 382/10 - Indigenous Communities of the Xingu River Basin, Pará, Brazil” (2011), \textit{Inter-American Commission on Human Rights}, The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights” Precautionary Measures” \url{http://www.oas.org/en/iachr/indigenous/protection/precautionary.asp}.
\textsuperscript{141} Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
In particular, this explained the recent critique of Mexico in the face of missing students in the state of Guerrero and Brazil regarding the Belo Monte dam. As the Brazilian official summarized, then Commission President Dinah L. Shelton had too much autonomy and made political decisions outside the score of legal mandate. In his words,

She felt that a Commission had to make a stand regarding the most important countries in order to establish the independence and the autonomy of the Commission. So, the Commission hit Mexico first. They had a lot of trouble with Mexico because of a decision they took regarding that case. After that, she decided to hit Brazil. This was just to mark the position that the Commission was autonomy and that the Commission had the power to do so.

This sparked fear for the Brazilians, but also many small South American states, who sought recourse to restrain the Commission. As the Brazilian official continued, “At that moment, most of the countries realized that the Commission was going through a path where nobody would be safe; safe in terms of knowing what to expect. So, if the [Commission’s] President woke up one morning thinking that, ‘Well, today we will have to say something hard against the United States: bam! Then they will do it, just to mark a position and that created a lot of uncertainty and worried many countries, of course.” The initial impulse came from the ALBA countries, but Brazil joined and took a leading role assuming a common position among South American states.

As the Brazilian official recalled, “everybody agreed to go along with them [ALBA states], because everybody felt that we needed come criteria, we needed some guidance, and we needed some rules to understand or to at least establish a relationship with the Commission...” The result of a two-year period to refine the Commission’s rules was the acceptance of a number of proposals and the rejection of others. As the Brazilian official suggested, the Commission established the rules for their behaviour in terms of the steps to be taken. Then they decided

among the many suggestions they’d got, which ones would be accepted. That was a decision taken by them. But, actually, what they did was to accept the decisions that had the full support of most of the countries [of the OAS]. That was quite reasonable. The ones that were rejected were recommendations made by some counties, and I don’t need
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143 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
to tell you which countries that I am talking about [i.e. ALBA]. These were countries that had the intention of hitting the Commission hard, and then trying to delimitate its power and put a fence around the Commission. They didn’t succeed. They didn’t succeed because most of the countries realized that it was important to have some rules, but it was also important keep the autonomy and the independence of the Commission. Because, if they don’t have this autonomy their work will not be useful. They would not be able to impose or to condemn anything done by the states. Any wrongdoing would have no penalty at all.

The result of this process, in the words of the Brazilian official recalling the developments was, that everyone was happy because from the point of view of the states we had now rules that we would know… in advance in order to deal with the cases. And the Commission had practices that they have to follow, some steps that they have to follow in order to reach a decision. And then it was good for them as well, because before this process they were accused of being very unstable in terms of decisions. Sometimes you a got a very hard decision imposed on a state, and sometimes you got an easy way so a country was almost free to go without penalty at all. So there was no defined rule or defined criteria for us, and for them, to act. So they were happy at the end of the way because they now have more objective steps to take and they know how to do it, and they know it wouldn’t depend on the President of the Commission. However is there will have to follow these rules and will have to take all these steps before reaching a decision. So, it was good for everyone.

For the South American practitioners, it was the question of the legality and the procedural rules of the Commission that lead to worry. Indeed, for the regional power Brazil and the small regional states alike, this legalist approach is indeed the ‘only game in town.’ Moreover, this is not assumed a necessity solely in reference to large, extra-regional powers (i.e. the US). Rather, safety and comfort was provided in reference to the regional powers as well.

As a Paraguayan official suggested, “it is very important to always be in an integration system. First of all, because we are a small, local, land-locked country. We need to be integrated. We are not Switzerland, you know?”\(^{144}\) As she continued, “we’re a land-locked country. We need to be in good relations, in all senses, with our neighbours. That is not easy.” As he continued, “The history shows us that there is always Argentina. They treat Paraguay with their *hegemonía*... We are between two big countries: Argentina and Brazil. And that has worked against our development.” Therefore, “We need to be treated

\(^{144}\) Interview with Paraguayan official, Washington, October 28, 2014.
the same way by all countries, by Argentina and by Brazil.” In his view, then it was natural and necessary for states to engage in formalized integration system with regional states. A similar sentiment came from a Peruvian diplomat who explained the underlying assumptions that generated this propensity:

We have Ecuador and Bolivia, then Chile and Colombia. They are all completely different neighbours. Then, of course the superpower of Brazil. So, for us it is a balance and balancing all the time…. So, for Peru it is all about dealing with different neighbours. Geography for us is just there and we have to deal with it, and to be a part of all these groups [regional organizations]. For Paraguay it is similar, but also about survival.145

Balancing here does not mean hard military balancing, or strategic alliances, but relying on formalized means of interaction with diverse and powerful neighbours.

As Chapter 3 explored, habitual thinking does not suggest the lack of reflexivity outright. It suggests these practitioners think from this foundation – they know they are small, vulnerable. As a result, the options that are reflected upon and delineated by the habitual qualities of regional relations, which in this case suggest a turn to safe, comfortable, formalized and rules-oriented interactions. The expression of this rules-oriented disposition and focus on formality in dialogue is a particular one, however.

An American diplomat suggested that South American practitioners have a “propensity for law, but they don’t have the same for implementation or following law.”146 Rather, as she continued, the focus is on merely “establishing instruments.” In her view, this often ignores “the flip side of the coin; the implementation.” As she explained, they have “many, many political implements and paper commitments” and “no lack of political meetings. They [South American states] are thick with regional and sub-regional agreements and mechanisms, at least on paper.” This penchant for signing agreements and institutionalizing practices was, for the American official, “fascinating” because it was distinct from his understanding of how normal diplomatic practices works – or should work. Flustered, he exclaimed with great animation that “Mexico, Canada, and the US all understand commitments and abide by them!” For these states, in her estimation,

146 Interview with American official, Washington, November 12, 2014.
normal process dictates that “You don’t sign unless you know you are capable of implementing. And when it comes to ratification, the first thing that is asked is if it needs implementation legislation.” In her assumption, this is simply not the case for South American practitioners who “sign first and then, perhaps, will think about implementation after… It is just how things are done.” In her view it was plainly distinct from her experiences with other international partners. In her estimation, this practice ensured that UNASUR was “useless” as it rested on this heavy, but ineffective legalism. Another American official at the OAS suggested the same, describing the nascent organization as “useless… it exists only on paper.”

A Canadian official echoed these frustrations and the assumption of abnormality in practice by suggesting that his common experience was that “they [South American representatives] will sign, and then worry about it.” A Chilean official mirrored almost exactly this sentiment, when she explained with a laugh that in her experience “We tend to put everything into a treaty and then you must it apply it all. But then you often realize you are unable to do it!”

South American officials, think from this approach to relations, rather than about it. While for the American and Canadian officials this was bizarre and ineffective, it was a natural part of the regional relations for South American practitioners.

In conducting interviews at the OAS in 2014 this divergent understanding of practice was evident in the disparate understandings of a series of declarations regarding the “Zone of Peace.” In 2002, all twelve South American states signed a largely symbolic “Declaration Regarding a South American Peace Zone” during the second meeting of South American presidents in Guayaquil, Ecuador. This made good on the earlier commitment in 2000 to establish a formal commitment to uphold regional peace in the Brasilia Communiqué agreed to two years earlier at the first meeting of regional presidents. Unsurprisingly, the declaration was founded upon existing and formalized agreements, chiefly the 1998 Declaration of Galapagos, which had pledged the Andean Community states to peaceful

147 Interview with American official, Washington, November 13, 2014.
148 Interview with a group of Canadian officials, Washington, October 30, 2014.
149 Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
relations, and 2002 Lima Declaration, and the corresponding Declaration of Mercusor, Bolivia and Chile as a Peace Zone (1998). For practitioners, this served to formally anchor the declaration to established and legally enforceable precedents – however aspirational they may seem to external observers. A core aspect of the short declaration was the ‘banning’ of the use or threat of force in the region. In 2014, the region sought to expand this ‘zone’ by making a similar declaration with the wider Latin American and Caribbean states through CELAC. The result was a 31-state declaration of “Latin America and the Caribbean as a Zone of Peace” that pledged states to support international law (i.e. the UN Charter) and respect the sovereignty of signatories to “ensure peaceful coexistence among nations” (Article 5). For South American practitioners, these developments were positive, natural and effective. For Canadian and American officials, however, it represented the puzzling formality and legal practices of her South American colleagues as well as a complication for existing agreements. As one Canadian official suggested, the 2014 declaration “meant nothing.” It was an empty agreement, and useless exercise in formality that only served to complicate existing tools of hemispheric cooperation like the inter-American Defense Board. In her view, the pledge undercut the legitimacy of the ADB because it suggested it was not need. For her, the pledge did nothing but express formality where it as not required. As she recalled, when she searched for the logic as to why the 2014 pledge was sought in the first place, her South American colleagues simply suggested “Why wouldn’t we?” This was perplexing to the Canadian official, and mirrored the conclusions of her American colleges in regards to UNASUR.

Another Canadian official offered an example that further illuminates this distinctive disposition towards legalist practices. In 2014 when I was speaking with interviewees at the OAS, there had been recent discussion regarding the integration of common narcotics policies across the hemisphere. The South Americans professed an interest in a leaders-level meeting to be held to set the agenda and draft agreements, followed two weeks after by a meeting of national technical specialists. This meant, the Canadians suspected, that
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150 Interview with a group of Canadian officials, Washington, October 30, 2014.
the leaders would then be more likely to have the technical specialists endorse whatever they agreed to – it would “ensure that their leaders were right,” in her words.\textsuperscript{151}

This official, external to the South American region, found this approach bizarre, ineffective, and troubling but recognized that it was inherent in the view of many of her Southern colleagues. In her words, the South American states “need it this way… that the political statement would drive the technical solutions the way they want it.”\textsuperscript{152} The Canadians, and the Americans as well she assured me, pushed for the meetings to be reversed: to have a meeting of the technocratic experts first and to then inform the substance for the leaders’ meeting. This would allow a more nuanced and implementable agreement, she reasoned, and appeared the normal and efficacious process. This was not to be the case. At the insistence of the South Americans, the meetings were planned differently. As a Canadian diplomat summarized, “we don’t get it… and we get dragged along.”\textsuperscript{153}

This does not suggest disinterest in effective agreements, nor does it suggest a lack of faith in the legal principles that underpin them. Rather, it highlights the dispositional and habitual starting point of South American regional relations in contrast to the North American practitioners at the OAS. It suggests a particular and assumed natural practice of procedural legalism, with a rules-based orientation and formalized dialogue. Similarly, as Canadian a practitioner cautioned, this should not suggest any difference in intent between the Canadians, Americans, and their South American colleagues. As she insisted, these states are just as committed to core OAS principles, but they understand the practice in a very different way.

As further illustration, she suggested I consider that Canada’s lack of ratification of the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials (CIFTA). While Canada has not formally adopted the agreement, although it is a signatory, it is the most compliant state, in her view. This is because Canada already operated under the core

\textsuperscript{151} Interview with a group of Canadian officials, Washington, October 30, 2014.
\textsuperscript{152} Interview with a group of Canadian officials, Washington, October 30, 2014.
\textsuperscript{153} Interview with a group of Canadian officials, Washington, October 30, 2014.
provisions of the agreement even prior to signing. Conversely, she suggested that in terms of both small arms regulation and human rights implementation, it were the South American states that were “well behind in actually adopting what they sign.”\textsuperscript{154} In her view, it was largely “aspirational.” This is distinct from the self-evident or normal way diplomacy works in her view. While this may be “testament to optimism,” in her view it is a “contradiction” in practice, and one her South American colleagues simply “don’t see.”

Another North American official working in the OAS made a similar observation when he cautioned me against assuming the understanding of ‘law’ between the North and South Americans he worked with was the same. He noted that the Canadians and Americans value a “particularly formulaic view of legalism” which was absent among the South Americans.\textsuperscript{155} In his view, Canadian and American “relationships” with other states follow after established legal “structures and systems” are in place. For the North Americans, in his view, proper and constructive diplomatic relationship requires the capacity of states to enact the agreements and promises made. On the other hand, “South Americans start with relationships among themselves, regardless if structures or systems align.” This observation underscores the differing understandings of legal process and what legal commitments mean for these regions and further underlines the dispositional quality of regional relations for South Americans.

This dispositional thinking is distinctly South American, and speaks to a legalist impulse shared widely by regional practitioners. While it is normal and natural for South American officials, it is not the case for the North American counterparts, and in stark contrast to the Southeast Asian thinking as explored in Chapter 6. In speaking to an OAS official whose vantage point would allow perception of this distinction in thinking and behaviour he suggested these “simply were different understandings of the practice.”\textsuperscript{156}

\textsuperscript{154} Interview with a group of Canadian officials, Washington, October 30, 2014.
\textsuperscript{155} Interview with OAS official, Washington, November 13, 2014.
\textsuperscript{156} Interview with OAS official, Washington, November 13, 2014.
In short, then, there is a relatively automatic and dispositional turn towards rules-oriented processes and formality in dialogue, but one that is not often matched by legal implementation. There is a dispositional impulse, even if absent procedural follow through. Ensuring the legal structure and basis for dialogue is essential for South American practitioners, even if the capability to engage and make good on legal commitments are less possible. This distinction in thinking is a pervasive and basic one. It undergirds how South American practitioners, in contrast to their colleagues from elsewhere in the OAS, tend to view regional relations.

Moreover, the legalistic impulse circumscribes action. It makes possible certain practices, while precluding others. In particular, it makes a recourse to formalized channels of dialogue (e.g. following the principles laid in out prior agreements) and turning to third-party mediation in the form of formal arbitration or quasi-arbitration and adjudication practices both possible and natural. By the latter, I mean providing for the support of third parties to offer recommendations and formally assist with facilitating the negotiation processes, but absent a commitment to binding arbitration. While not strictly adjudication, given often non-binding status, these kinds of engagement suggest a deeper and legalistic role for a third-party than mere ad hoc mediation (see Simmons, 1999).

The recourse to formal dialogue alongside third party arbitration and adjudication has been noted by a number of scholars (e.g. Palmer, 2001). Indeed, it appears a uniquely pervasive practice to the South and Latin American regions. The wider Latin American region has had 22 territorial disputes settled using third-party arbitration, compared to one small case in Europe, two in Africa, two in the Middle East, and three in Asia and the Pacific (Simmons, 1999: 6-7). This tradition has been particularly pronounced in South America, which experienced 14 of these 22 cases. Moreover, external mediation absent binding arbitration has been a particularly prevalent means of attending to territorial disputes in South America. For example, during the particularly violent inter-war period from 1925 to 1942, of the 28 territorial disputes in South America, 13 saw mediation by actors external to the region (Dominquez et al., 2005: 22-23). As I explore below, the 1941 Chaco conflict saw mediation from Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States,
in a typical South American practice. The 1942 Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Boundaries, or the Rio Protocol, that attempted to conclude the conflict formally bound these guarantor states to the conflict in a way congruent with recent regional attempts a varied forms of arbitration (see St. John, 1998/99). Most notable here, are the failed arbitration by the Spanish king, Alfonso XII, of the same dispute (concluded in 1910), the Swiss arbitration of the Colombian-Venezuelan border dispute in 1916, and the international Conciliation Commission convened to arbitrate the Paraguay-Bolivia Chaco-Boreal dispute (concluded in 1929) (see Wood 1966: 149-151; Simmons, 1999: 4-7; Mares, 2001: 48-49).

From the particularized and given proclivity to a rules-based orientation and formalized dialogue, South American practitioners have – perhaps uniquely – turned to formal means of dispute resolution and mediation of regional disputes. These processual qualities of regional relations are informed by an important substantive quality of relations – a common assumption of familiarity between South American states, despite the important and persistent differences and rifts between them.

**5.4.2 Habituated Content**

South American states and their practitioners exist within a relatively exclusive inter-state society of states. As with regions themselves, ‘fields’ are messy in this regard. They overlap and blur, but their boundaries remain perceptible in the thinking and behaviour of individuals therein. South American practitioners think from a basic and often inarticulate sense of community. This, however, is distinct from the ‘we-ness’ recognized of security communities as it does not imply a consciously-held assumption of trust, nor assumption of peaceful change. The South American sense of community is a basic, but important one for it delineates thinking absent reflection. South American practitioners know they are part of distinct regional community and one that through inarticulate but obvious ways serves to structure their relations in particular ways.
Across my interviews there was a common and inarticulate sense of community among even disparately interested state practitioners. Many South American officials suggested a “feeling” or “sense” of being “home” in various South American state contexts other than their, and most felt the opposite when living and working abroad, in Washington, Europe and elsewhere. For example, a Brazilian official described a history of diplomatic postings from Europe to Washington and back to a number of South American states. Returning to South America, she “was at home” in a number of countries, including Paraguay. As she described, “Even though some people are anti-Brazilian… there are papers there [in Paraguay] that label us imperialist. But even here… I felt at home.” To her mind, South America was one “world” distinct in largely inarticulate ways from that external to it. When reflecting the variation of membership at the OAS, she suggested that “They are totally different worlds in this sense. That’s why we try to have different levels of groups in the regions.”

In my interviews, I would often query just how and why these apparent but inarticulate similarities existed in the minds of those who thought from it. Many interviews struggled to articulate their sense of community, and offered suggestions of a common historical experiences. Some suggested a “common origin” or “Spanish heritage.” Others underscored the “common experience” with American hegemony or a common and “long history going back to Bolivar.” Others suggested the region was “culturally
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157 Interview with two Argentinian officials, Washington, November 6, 2014.
158 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
159 This parallels the arguments made in a wider sense by Adler (1997) who argues that this sense of ‘home’ is indicative of a “cognitive region.”
160 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
161 The inherent, foundational and often inarticulate commonality between states is something that has been recognized by scholars as well. Kacowicz traces this inarticulate sense of community to the days of Bolivar (Kacowicz 2005:49). Similarly, Centeno notes that the shared historical and cultural experiences have united regional thinking and established “shared heroes” that serve to inform regional behaviour (2002: 86-88). This was echoed explicitly in a discussion of South American history with a Brazilian official towards the end of a long interview. As he reflected, “What I feel is that in South America we have this commonality. First of all, it is history. Most of the countries have been saved by the same heroes.”
162 Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
163 Interviews with Chilean official (Washington, October 27, 2014) and Brazilian official Washington, November 6, 2014).
164 Interview with two Argentinian officials, Washington, November 6, 2014.
similar” and thus shared a distinct and “common way of life.” More specifically, perhaps some interviewees suggested it was a common “political culture” or “legal culture” of relations that bound South American states together and facilitated cooperation as a result of an ease of communication. In the words of a Brazilian diplomat, “It is easier for Brazil to think about integration when we speak about Argentina or Uruguay, Chile, Peru. And it is totally different than integration with Central America or in the Caribbean.”

The depth and consequence of this dispositional sense of community should not be overstated however. First, it is clear that this sense of community, alone, is not responsible for the establishment or the maintenance of peace. It may indeed predate the emergence of peace (i.e. Kacowicz, 2005) and it exists alongside episodes of its interruption. Further, the depth of this sense of community does not parallel the we-ness of security communities. There is not a common and shared expectation of peaceful change. State practitioners know that they are in a community that shapes their relations in relatively automatic ways, but this does not preclude the use of force. Further, as the empirical record shows, the use of force between states of this regional community has been a persistent feature of their relations throughout the long peace since 1941.

However, this basic sense of regional familiarity or community is a quality of relations that makes possible a further of cognitive and behavioural habits which have a restraining and retarding impact of regional violence and that colour the particularities of regional in South America. By thinking from this regional familiarity, South American practitioners circumscribe their relations in particular ways and with particular effect. What is normal and natural within this regional community of states is not for those external to this bounded community.
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165 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 13, 2014. A very similar suggestion came from my interview with two Argentinian officials, Washington, November 6, 2014 as well.
166 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
168 Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
170 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
This was brought into relief by a number of practitioners external to the region, but who engage with regional officials regularly. As an OAS Secretariat official suggested, “Like a lot of families, it has a lot of tensions and a lot of fights. There is a certain commonality there, but also huge, huge differences and tensions.” As he explained further, “You have the Pacific Alliance and you have the Mercosur countries, and they have real differences; in economic policy, in governance style, you know? You can just go through the list of major issues… They are going in different directions and there are profound differences.” Again, it is clear that basic regional unity and common experience does not denote a cohesive region in terms of interests and assumptions of peaceful change. However, this basic regional familiarity makes possible a distinct and common style of relations.

For most interviewees this was indeed the case, although all struggled to articulate just what this “feeling” or “sense” meant in practice. A Peruvian diplomat made this clear when reflecting on the intractable differences between her dealings with South American states and when the others states of the OAS, particularly the US and Canada, were present. She struggled to articulate why she felt this way, and suggested after some reflection that: “Just the dynamic changes and the way they talk.” An Argentinian diplomat suggested similarly that, “we just feel more comfortable” and it make “talking easier.” Another Peruvian diplomat offered a humorous description. As he suggested, “It’s a personal approach that we have. You have a phrase that I hear very much from Americans and Canadians here: ‘it’s not a personal thing’ or ‘It’s not a personal issue.’ But for us, Latin Americans, we always know ‘it is a personal issue!’ As he continued, “Every time you mix that personal and professional position, it mellows because of the personal relations. Now, this is something ‘very unprofessional.’ But it is what we do.”
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173 Interview with two Argentinian officials, Washington, November 6, 2014.
174 Interview with Peruvian official, Washington, November 4, 2014. This sentiment has been discussed in detail by Centeno, who notes it foundational to the cultural unity of the region, and traces it to the emergence of post-colonial states (2002: 91).
Similarly, a South American official reflecting on time spent at a post in the UK, suggested that South Americans

have a different way of thinking. We are more, and Latinos in general – are more easy going. When you meet a Latino guy, we normally say that in five minutes this guy tell you all about his life, everything about his life, and he will invite you to his house. This is an affectionate way of having a relationship. In London, what I felt was that people were very kind. They were very polite. But they have a way of living that imposes a distance from the others. I mean, people normally say that there was a line around each and every citizen and you should not cross that line, not touch that person or get too close to someone. And for us, this is the way of living.

As she continued, “Here [in Washington], people are not as circumspect as in London, but they have some distance as well. I mean, to become a friend to an American a person has to know you really well. So I won’t become friends with an American in five minutes as I would in Buenos Aires or Asunción or wherever.” As she continued this produces very different relations. “It is because you feel more involved with these [South American] people. You feel more accepted by them. When you have contact with someone that you feel that the person is all the time trying to show you that you have to be there, and I’ll be here, okay… After some years, maybe we will get along very well but not immediately. That is different.” A Brazilian official echoed this point, suggesting that compared to working external to the region, among his South American colleagues, “it is just easier to communicate. We feel more comfortable having frank conversations.” Although he cautioned against assuming this meant it was any easier to come to consensus: “it is easier to talk but also easier to disagree, and engage in frank and earnest conversations… but it is a kind of friendship that makes it easier to explain differences.” Stark divisions remain, however, and the cohesiveness of a South American regional community should not be overstated.

Indeed, a number of interviewees explicated noted that distrust is a feature of regional politics. A Peruvian official suggested Bolivian officials, representing a general disposition among ABLA states, “are more suspicious. They don’t tend to trust” her
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175 Interview with South American official, Washington, 2014. Details of nationality and dates removed to ensure anonymity.
176 Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 13, 2014.
South American colleagues,\textsuperscript{177} while two Ecuadorian officials suggested most “countries are not trusting” of each other in the region.\textsuperscript{178} Another South American official summarized it thusly, “there a lot of long-standing distrust, and there is the pursuit of national agendas, as well as a lack of a real will to really work together. That is just striking when you see a lot of examples; how presidents never went to other countries, or the provincialism and parochialism [of state interests].”\textsuperscript{179} In discussing these long-standing distrust and the history of antagonisms between Peru and Chile, for example, one Chilean official noted succinctly that cooperation exists “but only so far. The people remember their history… People don’t forget that.”\textsuperscript{180} In his experience working in Peru, he noted that children still learned of “Chilean cowards” in school, and that while he was, by his own description, “a friendly and pragmatic guy” when working with Peruvians there, he could feel lingering animosities. In these conversations there was a sense of hesitancy to explore this suggestion further, but it served to underscore the limits of the ‘community’ shared by these regional practitioners.

A Peruvian official made the underlying divisions apparent by suggesting that “We [South American states] are the most divided group [at the OAS]. We’ve got this ALBA, and the rest, and Brazil. We’re usually the most divided group.”\textsuperscript{181} As a second Peruvian diplomat suggested, the major concern for the present and future of regional relations were the “political tensions and the divisions” among South American states.\textsuperscript{182} As one regional diplomat reflected of South American institutions, “We have two visions of development – two visions of politics. One is denouncing capitalism and imperialism as a constraining factor… The other says that we can use openness and capitalism, investment, as a way to develop.”\textsuperscript{183} A Brazilian official echoed this assumption, noting that the key division in the region is a

\textsuperscript{177} Interview with Peruvian official, Washington, November 3, 2014.
\textsuperscript{178} Interview with two Ecuadorian officials, Washington, November 7, 2014.
\textsuperscript{179} Interview with OAS official, Washington, November 10, 2014.
\textsuperscript{180} Interview with Chilean official, Washington, November 11, 2014.
\textsuperscript{181} Interview with Peruvian official, Washington, November 3, 2014.
\textsuperscript{182} Interview with Peruvian official, Washington, November 4, 2014.
\textsuperscript{183} Interview with South American official, Washington, 2014. Details of nationality and dates removed to ensure anonymity.
dispute among these two concepts or these two different points of view. Brazil tries to build bridges between these two ways of facing problems or situations. Sometimes we succeed, but sometimes it is really impossible to find a consensus. This is because the positions are quite different. Venezuela for instance has a view of democracy that is totally different from Chile.\textsuperscript{184}

There are vastly distinct interests and organizations to reflect this. In the words of the Brazilian official, “you have the Pacific Alliance working very hard. And you have the ALBA countries. You have Mercusor. And so you have different interests. Sometimes they are able to be together, and sometimes it is impossible to reach an agreement.” As a Peruvian official with experience across various regional organization: “For me it is a given. We already know what we can and can’t do, especially with ALBA countries, but with Brazil too. They have their two or three issues, and we know ‘this is it’ and we just know. And I try never to confront those sort of issues.”\textsuperscript{185} A second Peruvian official suggested, “I don’t want to call it an ideology, but there are common objectives… [and] totally different social and economic policies.” A Colombian official lamented succinctly, regional unity is “such a mess.”\textsuperscript{186}

An OAS official focused on Political Affairs, made these divisions and their implications clear when he suggested,

That sort of division is real, and it impacts everything we do here. You know, even things that we do here as a matter of course, like election observation missions. It is complicated. We don’t get an invitation from Venezuela. We haven’t received an invitation from Venezuela since 2006… So, even in the case of election observation missions which in a way should be routine and for a lot of countries is routine, it is not the same thing. It requires a different approach according the group of countries you are dealing with. So, yeah, that division is real and it impacts what we do here.\textsuperscript{187}

This quick illustration underscores the point: while there are indeed important commonalities rooted in historical experience, made possible or reified through organizational cooperation over decades and there is, indeed, a basic unity to the region – a sense of regional familiarity – it should not be overstated. Major divisions and mistrust remain that diplomatic culture or style do not surpass. Thus a Peruvian diplomat

\textsuperscript{184} Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
\textsuperscript{185} Interview with Peruvian official, Washington, November 3, 2014.
\textsuperscript{186} Interview with Peruvian official, Washington, November 4, 2014.
\textsuperscript{187} Interview with OAS official, Washington, November 5, 2014.
suggested that, indeed, “We do have the same style. But more than that we have a strong set of ministers of foreign affairs with set careers. That makes the difference… it is about professionalized and career service members.” 188 An Ecuadorian official suggested much the same: “We have the same culture, but we are very different countries.” 189 While a basic community exists, it alone is consequential only because it facilitates a sense of basic and taken-for-granted qualities of regional relations therein. This unites practitioners, and offers a sense of familiarity and comfort, because practitioners know that when dealing with their South American colleagues, their practices are and assumptions are, by and large, competent and congruent.

This manifests itself in how regional institutions function. One South American official with experience working within the EU suggested this distinction by reference to her experiences in Europe. As she suggested it was clear that “they started differently. You can see that in Latin American groupings, they are less formal. You can feel it. You can feel that you’re in the region. In the European Union, the organization is much harder. They are more formal, and all that. But the systems are different. In the European Union, they are thinking supra-national. That is another style. It is another kind of organization. It is different, and it is different from the OAS too, absolutely.” 190 An Argentine official explained the differences between his understanding of the supra-national EU model and his practical experiences over decades of work in South America: “We are like a neighbourhood, and we are happy to have parties every night all together in all the homes. But we need our own homes to return to.” 191

In all these appraisals three commonalities are clear. They suggest a common but basic assumption of community, and a community with regional boundaries. Second, all assume that immersion in this community facilitates dialogue – somehow, as none could not articulate just why this was the case. Finally, all cautioned against assuming that

189 Interview with two Ecuadorian officials, Washington, November 7, 2014.
190 Interview with South American official, Washington, 2014. Details of nationality and dates removed to ensure anonymity.
191 Interview with two Argentinian officials, Washington, November 6, 2014.
easier communication lead to consensus or cooperation in and of itself. Division remained, even if a perceptible community of practitioners could be analytical distilled.

In sum then, there are four related attributes that are part of the habitual and dispositional quality of regional relations – of how South American officials ‘do things around here’ to return to Neumann’s suggestion. Practitioners begin from a foundation of an assumed regional community. This is a distinct sense of community form the lauded “we-ness” of security communities in that it does not provide for common expectations of peaceful change. Rather, it undergirds a basic set of legalistic habitual and dispositional qualities assumed normal, natural, and enacted largely outside of reflection. These include rules-oriented thinking and a predication for formality in dialogue, and the possibility of external mediation, including arbitration and adjudication. Each quality of this regional habitual deposition has been recovered through interpretivist interviews with South American regional practitioners, as outlined in Chapter 3, and are further brought into relief through interviews with extra-regional officials working closely alongside South American officials at the OAS. Through this particular method, the existence of a South American habitual disposition is clear. As with the Southeast Asian case, while many of these qualities may appear to align with the codified norms of the region and beyond, it is the particular regional understandings that shape behaviour and particular practices that are most consequential for regional relations. This discrete set of habitual and dispositional qualities informs regional relations, and structures the behaviours of states. To explore this claim and to link this South American habitual disposition to the long and conflictual peace, I turn to a two-fold investigation in the following section. The first documents the robustness of these qualities, something that I argue is showcased by practitioners who assume them not only the ‘only game in town’ but efficacious practices. Second, I trace the impact of these cognitive and behavioural qualities of relations by examining the regional response to the 1995 Cenepa conflict between Ecuador and Peru.
5.5 The Effects of Habit

By establishing a distinctive and practice practical sense to regional relations, this set of habitual qualities of relations facilitates cooperation and makes possible distinctive conflict management, absent the development of collective identity, or we-ness, as often conceived in IR literature. To explore the effects of this multifaceted habitual disposition, I now turn to how practitioners, themselves, view the pacific character of their relations.

5.5.1 Habits and their Effects I. Robust Habits

South American practitioners assume the pacific effects of their particular and habituated version of regional relations. Across the majority of my interviewees, there was a sense not only that pacific dispute resolution was possible, but also that it was only possible through particular brand of legalism. A number of interviewees suggested I compare the lack of war in their region to elsewhere. One Chilean official, for example, confidently asserted that, “in South America we resolve conflicts in a peaceful and negotiated way, more than Europe, more than Africa and even more than in East Asia too.”\(^{192}\) Another South American official suggested that “most of the conflicts have been contained. There have been flash points of tensions and potentials of eruptions, but most has been managed and kept under control.”\(^{193}\) A Brazilian diplomat credited the patchwork of regional institutions in South America for this reality, and suggested it was unique experience in the Western hemisphere: “I think in South America we have something that is unique from the other regions in terms of integration... All regions [in the hemisphere] talk about integration, but I think South America is the one that has more of the conditions to really get to a concrete result.”\(^{194}\)

Kacowicz recognizes a similar rhetorical claim as well, in what he terms a “strong strain of South American exceptionalism” (1998: 119). As he suggest, “South American

\(^{192}\) Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
\(^{193}\) Interview with OAS official, Washington, November 10, 2014.
\(^{194}\) Interview with Brazilian official, Washington, November 6, 2014.
diplomats and international lawyers usually assert that they have managed to develop a distinctive way of managing international relations in a peaceful way and much better than their European and Third World counterparts” (1998: 119). Moreover, many take pride in the formalized and juridical history of their region. A Paraguayan official made this clear, when she suggested that

That there is a very rich contribution from the Inter-American system of law [to regional relations]. Private law, now human rights, asylum rights, for example. And, there were important advances in diplomacy [from the region]… You need to recognize that the diplomacy tradition in some countries [of the region] is very rich. In Chile, for example, they are very rich [in diplomatic history and practice]. In Argentina, too… No doubt about it.195

As some have observed, these assumptions can actually lead to a form of moral hazard, where risky behaviour may be undertaken as actors are confident of the assumption that mechanisms exist to limit a situation before it escalates to war (see Dominguez et al., 2003: 14, 27-28). As one non-South American OAS official made this clear: “take a country like Venezuela, and Colombia. They have a dispute, and especially during the Uribe and Chavez years, it got pretty tense. But… people are restrained because they know that it could have tremendous consequences and, on the one hand they move closer to the brink [as a result].”196 As he continued, “There are a lot of these countries: Peru and Chile, Chile and Bolivia, and all these countries where there are still disputes and distrust, but still there is a recognition that they have to be managed and they [the disputes] have to be under control.” In his estimation, this was the result of “culture of restraint” among regional leaders and practitioners, which was made possible by the defense and driven legal means to manage regional disputes. Thus, “there may be difficulties [between states], but this is not a continent where there are major wars… So, while there are problems or tensions and conflicts, it usually doesn’t manifest in massively violent ways.”

While large-scale war has eluded the region, three major territorial disputes have persisted in recent decades: Ecuador-Peru over territory in the Cenepa region; Argentina-Chile over the Beagle Channel; and Colombia-Venezuela over the Gulf of Venezuela (see
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Martin, 2006: 87-97). The relatively axiomatic turn to diplomacy and to the pacific settlement of disputes can be traced by examining the regional response to one particularly violent conflict. In what follows I offer insight into the long regional peace by reference to the first of these enduring conflicts.

5.5.2 Habits and their Effects II. Habits and a 160-year-long conflict

One glimpse into the effect of habit and disposition comes from an examination of the long-held and violent dispute between Ecuador and Peru over the territory of the Mainas or the “Oriente” in the Cenepaa Basin along their Amazonian border, and the regional response. The divisive territorial claims spanned more than 160 years and have led to 32 MIDs, including two war-level conflicts (in 1941 and 1995), two mass mobilizations (1910 and 1981), and is, therefore, the most sustained and violent territorial dispute in the region (see Kacowicz, 2005:101; Mares 2001: 161; Palmer, 2001). Major military clashes over contested territory occurred in 1941, 1981, and 1995, and each time brought the states to “the brink of major war” (Martin, 2006: 88).

Beyond the risks involved, the 1995 Cenepa ‘war’ is particularly compelling case for three reasons. First, as noted, it represents the climax of a 160-year-long conflict that characterized regional relations beyond the scope of the two rival states directly involved. Second, it is a conflict between two democracies, albeit weak ones, that engaged in near-war level of violence (see Mares 2001, chapter 7; Marcella 1995; Palmer 1999). Third, since the 1980s, the growing economic interdependence of these states and rising political cooperation seemed to have little impact on the risks of territorial violence (Mares, 2001: 168; see also Herz and Nogueira, 2002 and Marcella, 1995). This conflict, then, is a particularly interesting case of violence in the long conflictual regional peace.

The history of the 1995 conflict has its roots in the independence of Peru and Ecuador (as part of Gran Colombia) from Spain in 1821 and 1822, respectively when the ill-defined
colonial borders were first assumed by the emergent states. Violent along this disputed border region escalated into war in 1828-29, and saw formal negotiation with a fully independent Ecuador in the 1840s. Despite occasional attempts at negotiating a formalized border, no diplomatic solution was found to the divisive claims and violence recurred sporadically into the 1930s. Since 1884 there have been as many as thirty-four violent clashes along the Amazonian border between the two (Simmons, 1999: 10).

By most accounts, the lack of interest in formally settling the borders until the 1930s was the result of indifference – the Amazonian border lands being largely unsettled and of little economic or geopolitical significance (Mares, 2002; Palmer, 2001). However, from the 1930s onwards a boom in rubber trade increased the potential significance of the territory and the militaries of both states engaged in limited disputes results that results from attempts to demonstrate effective occupation of the areas (Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 32-33). In the summer of 1941 a major surge in violence occurred, when a 15,000 strong invading force of Peruvians attacked the smaller 3,000 strong Ecuadorian force along the border with the aim of settling the border dispute through force (Marcella, 1995: 6). With a larger, more sophisticated force invading deep into Ecuadorian territory, the military victory was Peru’s and Ecuador was compelled to accept the 1942 Protocol of Rio de Janeiro, which provided for the removal of Peruvian troops and external military observers from four states. The Protocol was supported and guaranteed by four states: the United States, Argentina, Brazil and Chile who retained a legal obligation to mediate future disputes (Articles III, V, and VII). The geographic effect of the newly demarcated border was that Ecuador lost much of the Oriente Province it considered its sovereign territory, including an outlet to the Amazon River, while Peru ceded territory further north. The net exchange of territory was roughly 13,000 square kilometers in Peru’s favour from the previously agreed to ‘status quo line’ of 1936 (Kacowcz, 2005: 102). Politically, it was seen as a major success for Peru, and a major loss for Ecuador (Kacowicz, 2005: 103; Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 33-35). Regionally, the Rio Protocol served to formally link a four-part group of third-party states to the conflict. They were to
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197 For a survey of the historical origins of the dispute see Herz and Nogueira (2002: 25-31) and Simmons (1999).
continually “provide assistance” if and when the conflictual parties required (Article V and Article VII). The agreement was ratified by both states, and became the foundation for thinking about the conflict for these parties for over next fifty-six years.

However, one lingering issue remained with the Rio Protocol which would provide divisive and lead to a further series of militarized disputes. A 78-kilometer stretch of the borderlands, the Cordillera del Condor area, was left out of the agreement and was to be formally arbitrated by Brazil (see Kacowicz, 2005: 103). Three years later, the Brazilian naval officer in charge, Captain Braz Dias de Aguilar, laid down its findings, largely seeding the area in question to Peru. This decision was accepted by both states. However, two years later aerial photographs complicated this decision, as they seemed to suggest geographic features used to inform the demarcation were different than assumed in 1942. In 1948 demarcation efforts were halted as a result, and in 1960, Ecuador formally rejected the Rio Protocol under claims of both the geographical flaws in the demarcation process, and the duress from Peruvian occupation in 1942. The claim from Educator under the President Jose Maria Velasco Ibarra, was that the agreement was, thus both illegitimate, but also null under international law (see Kacowicz, 2005: 103; Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 40). However, Peru and the four guarantor powers maintained its legitimacy and legality.

In the decades that followed, Ecuador maintained its rejection of the Protocol on legal grounds in hope of altering the disputed 78-kilometer long border area and gaining access to the Amazon. For thirty years, Ecuador attempted a number of times to alter the legal standing of the treaty itself through formal and external means (see Kacowicz, 2005: 103-104; 106-107). The was issue raised through the OAS in 1959, 1965, 1980 and 1981, and through the UN in 1976, 1980 and 1991, and in 1968 Ecuador proposed an amendment to the Vienna Conference on Treaty Rights to null treaties signed under the threat or use of force (see Mares, 2001: 167; Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 51). Peru, however, continued to voice support for the 1942 Protocol and to defer to the guarantor states to assert its legal standing throughout this period.
As David Mares and David Palmer summarize, “For Ecuador, no solution would be acceptable that did not include sovereign access to the Amazon River. For Peru, no solution would be acceptable that did not adhere to international law and define the boundary in terms of the precise points specially laid out in the 1942 Rio Protocol. Such positions on both sides had wavered little between 1948 and 1995” (2012: 104; see also Mares, 2001: 165-167). It was clear during this continued debate as to the territory, that thinking and behaviour on both sides was couched in the legalities of the agreement. Thus, while they differed in terms of their interests, of course, they both acted through legalistic channels to pursue them. Indeed, as Kacowicz observes, “Throughout their 160 years of disputing the Orient, Ecuador and Peru articulated their conflict claims in distinctive normative and legal terms” (2005: 105). At the same time too, it was clear that this divisive and lingering territorial issue did not stymie regional integration. In 1969 both states joined in the Andean Pact, which promoted trade and economic integration between the two rivals.

Thus while this division remained it existed alongside growing organizational interdependence of these states. However, it remained a risk to relations and in 1995 yet another spike in tensions occurred, and war again appeared to loom between these states. Periodic violence had remained a pervasive reality throughout the period of growing interdependence. In January 1981 this peaked, with fears of open war when national mobilization occurred on both sides. The ‘Paquisha incident’, as it was to be known, saw Ecuadorian troops driven from their outposts by the Peruvian military in a move largely unilateral and outside of civilian government control. As many as 200 were killed in this advance (Mares 2001: 167). This underscored both the reality of sustained tensions and violence between these states, and also showed the limited control the emergent civilian governments on both sides over their militaries aggression (see Mares, 2001: 183; Marcella, 1995: 6; Varas, 1983: 76).

In response, Ecuadorian officials turned to the OAS in search of intervention, and Peruvian officials turned to the Rio Protocol and the four guarantor states (see Palmer, 1997). In both cases, the automatic recourse among politicians was to turn formalized
means of dispute resolution involving third parties and established legal frameworks. The OAS demurred, given the precedent established by the Rio Protocol, and left the guarantor states to mediate (see St. John, 2000: 30). Their effect was slow and incomplete (see St. John, 2000: 30; Mares, 1996/97: 110). In response, the four guarantor states – or “friendly countries” as they termed themselves so as not to evoke the language of Rio – proposed a ceasefire and halted the fighting but refused to do more until Ecuador recognized the Protocol, which it did not. This turn to formalized channels of mediation quelled the conflict for only a brief time, and a series of nine disputes occurred after the conclusion of this episode until 1995 when war again seemed likely. However during this period, once again, as Mares observes, “Relations between the two countries did not deteriorate despite the MIDs” (2001: 168). Economic cooperation accelerated and Alberto Fujimori became the first Peruvian President to travel to Ecuador in 1991. Still, during this period, both parties maintained support for divergent legal frameworks to manage their simmering tensions, and the tension did not dissipate. Peru maintained its staunch support for the previsions in the Rio Protocol, while Ecuador continued in their repudiation their rejection of the agreement in favour of using the OAS. The issue was thus left to fester, even while economic and political relations grew. It was the flare of violence in 1995 that would prove the most serious military confrontation, however.

On January 26 1995 Ecuadorian attempted to dislodge a Peruvian outpost along the disputed stretch of border at Tiwintza (see Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 43-44). Without civilian political oversight, the Ecuadorian provocation was seen by many as far more severe than the routine patrol skirmishes that had characterized the conflict in recent years (see Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 46). In the 34 days of violence that followed, fatality estimates range from as low as 47 (Martin, 2006: 93) to perhaps 200 (Simmons, 1999: 12) or 500 (Kacowciz, 2005), or as high 1000 (Mares, 2001: 168), 1500 (see Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 47), or “unconfirmed estimates” of 4000 (Palmer, 2001: 32). Beyond the debated fatalities, it is clear that both sides engaged in large-scale military clashes including the use of helicopters, fighter-bomber aircraft, artillery and as many as 6000 soldiers in the area of the fighting and wider mobilization elsewhere (see Marcella, 1995; Kacowicz, 2005: 104; Simmons, 1999: 12). Given the scale and technological
sophistication of the conflict, Gabriel Marcella concludes that “a new threshold has been crossed” in terms violence in the region (1995: 12). Similarly, Herz and Nogueira rely on an intuitive qualitative assumption to suggest it as a “war” “given the level of mobilization of the armed forces, the risk of escalation, and the relevance of the issue of the national security of both countries in a long history of rivalry” (2002, 47; see also Dominguez et al., 2003: 13).\textsuperscript{199}

From the outbreak of fighting in January to its conclusion in February 1995 there was a concerted diplomatic effort to deescalate the violence, and later to formally resolve the disputed territorial claims. The habitual disposition of regional relations, as outlined, both shaped and sustained these efforts, and shed light into the decades of failed efforts that preceded them. In what follows I trace this impact.

From the outbreak of the conflict, both Peruvian and Ecuadorian leaders sought to couch their claims firmly within regional and extra-regional legalist channels, just as they had in response to the 1981 crisis and in keeping with long-held proclivities throughout the 160-year history of the conflict. The Peruvian preference was, as was a long-standing practice, to defer to the Rio Pact and seek formal support and arbitration from the four guarantor states as outlined in the agreement. For Ecuadorian officials, the menu of options once again appeared wider but all formal and legalistic. Fearing escalation, Ecuadorian officials pursued three channels of diplomatic solutions. Mirroring their long-held deferral to the UN and OAS, Ecuadorian President Sixto Duran Balle sent a communiqué to the president of the UN Security Council and sought an extraordinary meeting of the OAS Permanent Council (see Herz and Nogueira, 2002: 50). At the same time, however, he signaled a change from previous repudiations of its legal status dating back to 1960, and embraced the Rio Pact, publically seeking mediation from the Rio Protocol guarantors as a means to deescalate the crisis (Mares, 2001: 168).

\textsuperscript{199} Interestingly, Holsti largely ignores the conflict, describing it as a mere skirmish with limited casualties and consequence (1996, 160). However he does recognize it as indicative of “the extent to which crises and border incidents remain a part of the South American diplomatic and military landscapes” (1996: 160). Regardless of the severity captured by empirics, many scholars see this as an aberration that proves the rule of long-regional peace but also one that demonstrates its potential ephemerality.
Rather than accepting the Protocol in full, however, the Ecuadorian position was that the Protocol should be renegotiated (Marcella and Downes, 1999: 7; Kacowicz, 2005: 104). Unsurprisingly, it is clear that all options both parties sought to mediate the conflict were formal and couched in existing legal principles both internationally and regionally. In this way, the crisis was internationalized almost immediately. These attempts to seek the mediation of the guarantor states came early in the conflict, and it was in February 17th that the first ceasefire was planned between the parties and the guarantor states with the Peace Declaration of Itamaraty (*Declaración de Paz de Itamaraty*). Not only did this suggest an immediate turn to internationalizing the conflict and drawing in foreign mediation, but it also suggested a broader framing of the issue from within the established legal precedent. Thinking from the Rio Protocol, and thinking from the established practices of regional dispute resolution was clear early in the crisis. Indeed, it appeared another case in the growing “history of policy-makers analyzing issues from a legal rather than geostrategic perspective” (Holsti, 1996: 170).

The first discussions between the parties and the guarantor states centered on a three-part plan to halt and then resolve the conflict: stabilize the military conflict, primarily though the establishment of a demilitarized zone and the introduction of military observers (MOMEP, Military Observer Mission, Ecuador Peru), provide formal definition of outstanding issues of disagreement, and facilitate substantive negotiations of those issues (see Palmer, 2001: 35-36). These followed the principles enshrined in the Rio Protocol. However, this preliminary set of agreements did not automatically instill trust, nor did they stop the fighting. Persistent skirmishes broke out along the border in the following week, despite the introduction of observers. Again, the guarantors sought a ceasefire and both sides signed the Declaration of Montevideo eleven days later, on February 18. This agreement authorized further deployment of military observers in an effort to restrain the militaries of each state, and solidified the Rio Pact and the guarantor states as the only mechanism to address the conflict (Herz and Noguiera, 2002: 51). Again, thinking from the established legal precedent dictated the means to address the crisis.
This preliminary series of dialogues following the means laid out in Rio, further formalized the framework for resolution and shaped the coming years of negotiations. Over the series of negotiations in 1995, the parties had halted the use of force and concretely had begun to establish the framework to address the lingering disputes, which would take much longer (Herz and Noguiera, 2002: 52-53; Palmer, 2001: 36). In particular, the decision was reached to defer to the recommendations of guarantor states. In January of 1996 the foreign ministers of Peru and Ecuador met alongside the representatives from the guarantor states to agree on the framework for further negotiations: it would be held in Brasilia with the five-strong delegation conducting discussions in secret. At the same time, the observation mission would continue.

A series of further agreements were devised to outline the issues that would be discussed and the framework by which any agreement may be implement. This included a series of preparatory meetings from January to June of 1996. During these meetings the decision to address the lingering disputes was agreed to be nearly arbitral. Ecuador and Peru would provide a list of disagreements and disputed items, the guarantor states would support bilateral formal, secretive discussion of these issues, and remaining impasses would be passed to the guarantor representatives for recommendation. While these recommendations would not be binding at this stage, it did signal both acquiescence to formal mediation from parties both external to the conflict and external to the region (the US), and the support of both states for third-party designed-means of conflict resolution (see Herz and Noguiera, 2002: 53). This decision, agreed to in the Santiago Accord of October 1996, laid out the means for formal bilateral negotiation over the ‘subsistent impasses’ noted in the prior Itamaraty Declaration, affirmed the support of the four guarantor states, and provided for their increased involvement wherein they would “propose the procedures best suited to definitively resolve those points of disagreement that the parties will have been unable to resolve themselves.”

Thus, again, while not formal arbitration, it demonstrated a willingness to both continue the internationalization
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of the conflict and directly engage the four guarantor states in the settlement of the dispute.

Formal substantive negotiations began in April 1997 and over six rounds concluded in November 1997. They saw the direct involvement of the guarantor states at all stages. After months of slow progress and the resignation of both the Ecuadorian foreign minister Francisco Tudela and the head of its delegation, Alfonso Arias Schriber, the guarantor states took a further leading role in refining the agenda and structuring the discussions around four key pillars of issues with corresponding commissions. This was formally adopted in January of 1998. Four commissions were launched, each focused on a different issue of contention and each hosted in a different guarantor state, and a formalized mechanism designed to allow the Peruvian and Ecuadorian foreign ministries to evaluate the recommendations of these institutional recommendations was agreed to (Herz and Noguiera 2002: 55-58; Simmons 1999: 15-16). During the months of work by the commissions, tensions along the border again were stoked, but the leadership in both states attempted to mitigate the risks. In particular, the announcement of the Ecuadorian purchase of Israeli Kfir fighter-bombers was seen as a potential disruption of the process. However, Peru did not respond and there was no claim of breaching the terms of the established case-fire (see Simmons, 1999: 17). Restrained rhetoric and pursuit of the legalist channels developed characterized the relationship between Presidents Fujimori and Mahuad throughout the crisis. The two quickly developed a working relationship and met seven times between August and September to reinforce the work of the commissions and demonstrate support the formal processes (see Herz and Noguiera, 2002: 59). Ultimately, this series of discussions led to an agreement on issues of commerce and navigation but impasses on the others. In particular neither president could agree to that lingering issue which had stymied cooperation since 1941: Ecuador demanded access to the Amazon, and Peru refused (Palmer 2001: 40-41). At this point, again, it is clear that the particularities of practice of this community of practitioners
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201 These concerned navigation and commerce (Commission I), border economic integration (Commission II), land border demarcation (Commission III), and confidence- and security-building (Commission IV) (see Herz and Noguiera, 2002: 55-58)
dictated behaviour. Both presidents then, again, turned to support from the guarantor states as means to breaking the impasse.

Rather than merely flirting with a formal arbitration process, they now embraced it and agreed to accept binding arbitration on the remaining issues, deferring to the recommendations of the guarantor states. Both presidents wrote letters to the Brazilian President, Alfonso Cardoso, noting the impasse and pledging to accept formal and binding arbitration from the four guarantor states (Kacowicz, 2005: 104). This cumulated in the Act of Brasilia, and was agreed to by both Peru and Ecuador. Formal demarcation of the border concluded in May 1999. Of this final agreement Palmer remarks that it “highlight[s] the significance of individual leadership and the personal role of key participants in diplomacy in working through difficult, historically intractable issues between two countries” (2001: 41; see also Simmons, 1999: 16). While it does, it also shows the habitual and dispositional thinking that binds this particular regional community within they operate. Throughout the conflict, behaviour and thinking was shaped by commonly held and unproblematic assumptions of legalism, rules-oriented processes, and mediation, however varied in interpretation.

This congruence can be underscored further, given that in both states there were tremendous changes in domestic politics during the course of the crisis and its resolution. While there was relative continuity in terms of the focalized and legalistic approach to diplomacy here, and while there was sustained political support for these efforts, there were major political changes. While two successive Fujimori administrations in Peru, Ecuador saw four presidents during this three-year period of negotiations. The most extreme instance of change was the replacement of Ballen by Abdala Bucaran in February 1996, for “reasons of insanity” (Herz and Noguiera 2002: 77). Yet as Herz and Noguiera (2002: 77) note, there remained a “striking continuity of Ecuador’s general disposition to come to terms with the problem and sign a definitive peace in a context ripe with opportunity to use the conflict Peru for purposes” (emphasis added). This same claim can be said of Peru. As has been explored, the habitual and dispositional character of regional relations serves to offer insight. Practitioners thinking from this discrete set of
normal and natural behaviours transcends political changes and in many ways shaped the
taking and behaviour of officials in addressing the crisis. Simmons (1999: 14), too,
obsvives this surprising continuity:

In this case, a popularly elected president whose economic policies sparked a violent
national strike was removed from office by congressional vote for “mental
incompetence” after serving only six months, without either a setback for the border talks
or disturbances at the border. This political crisis certainly would have been an
opportunity for either the soon-to-be-deposed president, the congress, or even the
military to use the territorial issue to unite the country, but none did

Throughout the crisis, the approach to resolution remained the same: a legalistic approach
to formalized talk, with the assumption among practitioners that a peaceful solution was
possible and preferable.

This is a particularly interesting case not only because it demonstrates large scale
violence between economically interrelated and democratic states in South America, and
underscores the conflictual nature of the long peace of the region, but also because the
mediation efforts during the conflict illustrate the particular habitual and dispositional
qualities of regional relations. Both the persistence of this dispute and the shape and
character of its diplomatic solution reflect the particular realities of regional relations
here.

First, it is clear there is an underlying sense of regional familiarity. Again, this does not
suggest a the development of a we-ness akin to the European experience, but rather a
bounded community wherein certain practices and approaches to relations are given,
necessary, and effective. These practices, it is clear, are defined by formality, rules-based
orientation, and a turn to mediation by external parties. From the outbreak of the crisis in
both the 1980s and again in 1995, the parties turned to established, and formalized means
to mediation and resolution. In 1995 this meant, by and large, a turn to the formal
channels agreed to fifty years prior with the Rio Protocol, and thus the arbitral authority
of the four guarantor states.
While this case illustrates the particular habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations here, it also serves to illuminates both the strength and limits of these qualities of diplomatic relations. The recurrent crises that finally lead to the 1995 near-war were made possible by an inability to formally resolve the conflict. Borrowing the language from skeptical North American officials at the OAS, it was clear that “paper agreements” were just that.202 From the 1940s to the 1990s agreements were reached and provisions established which became the basis for thinking and action on the agreement, but were not strictly observed.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter has suggested, again, that that disparate communities of regional diplomatic practitioners embody, act out, and often reify discrete sets of habitual dispositions – deeply taken-for-granted knowledge of the world that, relatively automatically, shape their behaviour. South American diplomatic practitioners exhibit a discrete set of habitual and dispositional qualities of relations. They think from, rather than about certain ways of confronting and managing regional problems, and furthering their individual and collective interests. Within this particular regional community of practitioners, this multifaceted habitual disposition rests on assumptions of a basic familiarity of regional states, which provides for relatively axiomatic engagement of regional and global norms – non-interference, sovereign territorial equality, and peaceful settlement of disputes. From this foundation springs a particular and legalistic form of conflict management and of regional relations more generally. Officials from these small states think from a recourse to formalized, rules-based dialogue and afford the use of third party mediation in disputes. This shapes how they view crises and delineates their efforts to manage them. As the long-standing Peru-Ecuador border dispute suggests, while regional practitioners may have disparate assumptions of what these qualities mean – what is legal and rules-based in this sense – they think from a turn to these formal qualities of relations. As such, this set of habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations undergirds the deflationary behaviours which have reduced the risk of wider escalation of such conflicts.

In this way, these particular habits, themselves, undergird patterns of conflict management and, in short, they are a proximate cause of wider and puzzling pacific realities of this region.

With these conclusions in mind, it is also already clear that the South American habitual disposition, despite a shared normative framework, is distinct from that of Southeast Asia – one relying on assumptions of formality in relations and another informality. In the following Chapter, I turn to compare these habitual foundations of relations and their consequence for patterns of regional cooperation.
Chapter 6.
Conclusions, Comparisons, and Implications

6.1 Introduction

The central interest of this research has been to uncover the particularities of regional conflict management practices, and in so doing illustrate a proximate cause of the long and conflictual peace of Southeast Asia and South America. In short, the ambition has been to illustrate how peaceful regional relations actually ‘work’ in practice, and in so doing highlight the diversity of practices that work across different communities of state practitioners. In the two preceding empirical chapters I advanced two central arguments in pursuit of this interest. First, I suggested that distinct habitual dispositions exist in both Southeast Asia and South America. Second, I suggested that these rather banal qualities of regional relations have important effects. They shaped the behaviour of states by delineating possible action for important regional practitioners, and in so doing, these habitual and dispositional qualities of relations inform the patterns of conflict and peace in each regional case.

This action-near investigation provides novel insights into the puzzles of peace in each region: In Southeast Asia, territorial disputes and inter-state rivalries have been all but endemic, yet war largely eludes the region and since the 1960s it has emerged an increasingly integrated one. In South America, despite persistent territorial disputes and political instability, inter-state war has been the exception rather than the rule since the 1940s. In both cases, scholars have long recognized a puzzling long peace – a quality of relations often assumed a puzzle itself in the international system where conflict and the potential for war is inherent. Studies of long-term pacific relations and the transition from conflict-prone to cooperative regional relations often focus on developed world and Europe in particular, highlighting the consequence of the liberal and democratic qualities of states. However, each of these regions has been populated traditionally by illiberal states, absent many of the hallmarks of long term regional cooperation seen elsewhere. In
both regions, intra-regional relations have been circumscribed by their own, particular and discrete sets of habits of inter-state cooperation. Analytically, these habitual dispositions help us to understand the foundations of pacific regional cooperation and to understand integration among illiberal states alongside persistent levels of inter-state disputes. In this chapter I to conclude by bringing these cases into comparison and offering a statement as to the utility of this framework to explore others.

6.2 Comparing Habits of Regional Relations

In both Southeast Asia and South America regional diplomatic practitioners embody, act out, and often reify discrete habitual dispositions. In practice, this delineated thinking circumscribes behaviour and informs how regional – and indeed global – norms of appropriate conduct are understood and enacted in each regional community. It is through habitual dispositions that actors recognize problems and perceive potential solutions. Regional practitioners think from, rather than about certain ways of confronting and managing regional problems, and furthering their individual and collective interests. However, as the two preceding empirical chapters make clear, the composition of these habitual dispositions of different regional communities are decidedly distinct. The disparate habitual and dispositional qualities of the two regions under study here are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Southeast Asia</strong></th>
<th><strong>South America</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>Prior regional consensus</td>
<td>Rules-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal dialogue</td>
<td>Formal dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process v. substance</td>
<td>External mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Non-interference</td>
<td>Regional familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equality of members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-saving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peaceful settlement of disputes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Southeast Asia, relations are informed by a seven-part habitual disposition. Practitioners automatically engage in procedures of prior consensus and informal dialogue, and naturally privilege process over substance. Automatically, they are
disposed towards non-interference, equality among ASEAN members, and share an impulse towards face-saving and pacific dispute settlement through talk rather than formal legal channels. Together, these form the foundation Southeast Asian diplomatic practitioners think and act from. In South America, practitioners think and act from a four-part habitual disposition that rests on a given and dispositional understanding of regional familiarity, and ascribes to a particular rules-oriented and formalized dialogue in relations that affords a recourse to formal, external mediation and arbitration of regional disputes.

These are distinct orientations towards action and have led to distinct means of regional conflict management. Clearly, Southeast Asia’s informality is in stark contrast to the legalistic impulse and formalities in dialogue that animate the relations of South American states. So stark are these divisions that little illustration is required to bring them into relief. However, the variable foundational thinking of practitioners in each region can be further glimpsed by comparing how regional diplomats and organizational officials understand competent and efficacious responses to regional crisis.

As has been explored in Chapter 4, Southeast Asian officials responded to the outbreak of hostilities in 2011 along the Thai-Cambodian border by turning to what they inherently knew as normal and efficacious means of inter-state relations. Again, this does not suggest there was no reflection or agency on the part of important regional officials. Rather, the agency of Southeast Asian practitioners was delineated and shaped within the bounds of their habitual disposition. With the recognition of a crisis, regional practitioners turned readily to engage in what they knew was possible and what they knew worked for them. In stark contrast to the assumptions of ‘normal diplomacy’ from their European and Western colleagues in Jakarta, Southeast Asian practitioners turned to sustained and decidedly informal dialogue, and officials actively attempted to keep the mediation and resolution of the crisis within regional bounds. Among key intra-regional practitioners, there was no reflection on rival means to respond to a regional dispute as they defined it, and, as one ASEC official noted, there is a pervasive assumption in such crises that “we’ll deal with it, and we’ll do it our own way. But we don’t want to be stuck
with too much on the legal side.” The given, ready-made means towards a possible solution, then, was to attempt slow and informal talks outside of any established regional or global legal framework. Habitually, there was a possible means to collectively respond to the crisis, and it was a particular one.

Across the Pacific in South America, there was a similarly axiomatic turn to respond to a similarly violent regional crisis in 1995. Here too, a community of regional diplomatic officials knew what was normal, what was possible, and what worked for their regional relations when violence again broke out along a contested intra-regional border. However, the processes and the content of the axiomatically engaged with regional means of conflict management were distinct from those of Southeast Asia. The South American response to the outbreak of hostilities along the Peru-Ecuador border in 1995 was in many ways in opposition to the practices enacted by Southeast Asian officials in 2011. Recalling the succinct – and common – assumption of a Peruvian official: “We need clear and established rules to be protected.” Just as this reality drove South American interests in revising and further formalizing the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, it shaped the regional response to the Cenepa conflict two decades earlier. As Palmer concludes of the Peru-Ecuador case, “It demonstrates that even the most deeply ingrained differences between states can be resolved with patient and persistent efforts by both the countries immediately involved and other interested parties as well. It suggests the importance of recourse to international legal principles and the documents that underlie them” (2001: 44). This statement stands in stark contradiction to the Southeast Asian experience. One the one hand, to “feel safe and comfortable” as one South American diplomat put it, South American practitioners axiomatically turned to the “heavy” and particular legalism of the region. For Southeast Asian practitioners, on the other hand, safety and comfort stems from an absence of formality, and from practices of conflict management that ensure they will not be “stuck with too much on the legal side.”
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There are, thus, profound distinctions in the habitual disposition of these two regions and profound similarities. In common, is the existence of a habitual disposition – thinking and behaviours that are given and natural to regional practitioners. In contrast, the processes and content of these diplomatic habits are hugely varied.

A third and related commonality is also clear. Not only does a habitual disposition exist in both communities of regional practitioners – however varied in form – but within each practitioners assume a basic competence of their habitual dispositional traits. In each case, officials know their habits to be normatively good and to be productive of pacific regional relations. As the empirical cases made clear, in both regional communities practitioners knew in the face of crises that their particular brand of diplomacy would work, and more generally regional practitioners continue to know that their understanding of normal diplomacy is what works best for their region. This given faith in the competence of diverse regional practices was clear across both regional cases. As one Secretariat official at ASEAN suggested, the habits and practices of the region are “a necessity that works most effectively.”

This short assertion makes clear two underlying foundations for relations that are common to both regions.

Practitioners simply know that their brand of diplomacy is a necessity. That their distinct set of practices ‘just works’, was a common refrain across both regional communities. Heavily, particularized legalism works for South American officials, while it appears puzzling and suboptimal for North American officials working alongside them within the OAS. Informality and assumptions of prior consensus-seeking are inherent and efficacious for Southeast Asian practitioners, while they seem frustrating and bewildering to European officials working in support of the ASEC. These presumed necessities are indeed the ‘only game in town’ for practitioners within each regional field.

In each case the necessity of turning towards these habituated and dispositional qualities of regional relations was inherent. As Chapters 4 and 5 outlined, practitioners think from
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rather about their brand of diplomacy. However, when pushed to reflect on other means and other potentials for relations, practitioners in both were dismissive. This necessity stems in both cases from historical experience and the commonly learned lessons that these communities of practitioners assume as given. For both, practitioners recognize that they are small states in dangerous neighborhoods. This was particularly stark in the case of South American practitioners, who recognize the relative size and power of their states and suggest the relative power of neighbouring states dictates and justifies the adoption of formalities in relations within and beyond the region.

Second, both communities of regional practitioners not only know that their brand of diplomacy is works, but assume it works most effectively. Across interviews with both Southeast Asian and South American practitioners, there was a shared sense that their region was uniquely peaceful and their habits of diplomacy, therefore, uniquely effective. Indonesian Ambassador Gede Ngurah Swajaya, makes this common suggestion clear:

[There has been] no war after ASEAN has been established. Yes, there are some tensions but these tensions can be reduced. Some of the territorial disputes have already been resolved through the ICJ. But some do remain. But we have discussions. The talking is still there… And, I mean, what is wrong with talking? You know, for other countries and other regions, they don’t even talk. Then a rocket is talking. A weapon is talking.  

The same suggestion came from Indonesian ex-Foreign Minister Hassan, as noted in Chapter 4, when he asked me to consider other regions:

I would argue that it was because of dialogue, because of talk, that here [in Southeast Asia] we enjoy peace and security – and continued peace and security. And people would appreciate [this] better if we [were] compared to other regions. Look at what is happening in the Middle East or some parts of Africa. It is because the respective regions were not able to manage their own household [that they lack peace and security].

South American practitioners, too, assume the pacific effects of their particular and habituated version of regional relations and assume them uniquely consequential. In words that mirror Minister Hassan almost precisely, one Chilean diplomat confidently asserted that “in South American we resolve conflicts in a peaceful and negotiated way,
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more than Europe, more than Africa and even more than in East Asia too." These common sentiments suggest that not only are the discrete and varied habits of regional relations and conflict management given and natural within their respective communities, but they are known to be uniquely effective in the minds of regional practitioners.

In sum, practitioners in both regions think from a set of habitual and dispositional qualities. However, these habitual and dispositional qualities vary widely between these two cases – there are many ‘normal ways that diplomacy works’. Further, in each, regional practitioners know that their distinctive habitual disposition does indeed ‘work’; they know it is efficacious. In both cases, communities of diplomatic practitioners rather unthinkingly know what competent and efficient inter-state relations look like, and in both cases this image is distinct. They shape the behaviour of regional practitioners and inform how crises responded to. As such, they suggest an important element in understanding longer-term patterns of conflict and cooperation in each regional case.

The immediate lesson of this summary comparison is that habitual dispositions exist, are varied, and that varied habitual dispositions have effects. There is, indeed, not one ‘normal way that diplomacy works’. This conclusion foreshadows the contributions and implications of this research, to which I turn to now.

6.3 Contributions and Implications

This project makes three related contributions to the field of IR: (1) methodologically by developing one means of uncovering the existence of habitual and practical qualities of inter-state relations and tracing their effects; (2) theoretically, by articulating and documenting the relationship between codified norms and inarticulate practices, and; (3) substantively by exploring the particularities of Southeast Asian and South American conflict management as a proximate cause of the long and conflictual patterns of peace observed in each case. I explore these briefly in turn.
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First, and methodologically, this work has built on well-explored subjective (Pouliot 2008; 2010) and relational (Fujii 2017) methodologies to demonstrate one means to uncover habit, practice, and habitual dispositions and to explore the consequence of these self-evident and inarticulate qualities of inter-state relations. As ethnography and participant observation are often not possible for IR research – given analytical interests in the world of high politics and action that occurs outside a public view – interview research offers a second-best option to explore the cognitive and practical issues of concern to many in the field. However, there is a growing interest in assessing the methodological rigor of interview research and its suitability to interrogate norms or uncover practices (e.g. Hopf, 2011). As many have recognized, it is a challenge for members of a community to articulate their own understandings of community practices and thinking. Rather, through interview research “representations of practice… have to be carefully interpreted” by a researcher (Bueger and Gadinger, 2015: 457). The methods employed here, and methodology described in detail in Chapter 3, offers a means to this end. By exploring the practices, habits, and background-ed thinking of regional practitioners through detailed interviews and by contrasting the thinking and behaviour of one community of practitioners with another existing alongside it, it is possible to uncover and document the existence of a habitual disposition that each community embodies, acts out, and perhaps reifies in action. To explore the latter suggestion, and view the consequence of these habitual and practical qualities of relations, this research pursued two means. First, was to explore the robustness of these habitual qualities. When officials not only view certain practices as self-evident but also, when pushed to reflect on their efficacy, know them to be effective and legitimate it is likely that these qualities of relations inform community behaviour. Further, tracing the existence and effect of these habitual and practical qualities of relations within particular cases of crisis response and regional conflict management serves to illustrate their consequence. In this way, these particular habitual and dispositional qualities appear a proximate cause of wider patterns of regional relations and of conflict and peace therein. However, this is a means of uncovering the dispositional, habitual, and practical qualities of the social and political world beyond the confines of these two empirical explorations of conflictual peace as well. Indeed, it could be utilized to offer an investigation in wider patterns of community
relations and uncover the foundations of stability in terms of not only of relations of amity but of enmity, and beyond an interest in inter-state relations.

Similarly, this research offers wider implications in terms of theory building. A pillar of the theoretical framework developed in this project is the recognition of the interrelationship between norms and practice. Even in the social constructivist literatures where they are most appreciated, these aspects of the social world are often analyzed independently. This research has underscored their interdependence. The relationship *between* norms and practice is something that has escaped existing accounts of habit and practice in IR as outlined in Chapter 3. However, it is clear that the practices and habits of both Southeast Asian and South American diplomatic relations and distinctive approaches to conflict management are not divorced from codified norms. Rather, the habitual and practical qualities of regional relations often represent self-evident and inarticulate understandings and competent performances of norms in action. In each community of practitioners of study here, there are particular relationships between overarching and abstract inter-state norms and specific practices that may, from an outside perspective, appear to bend them. In terms of implications for theory-building, it is clear that examinations of habit and practice need not reject a focus on norms, but understand codified and abstract norms as potential sources to anchor practices and as open to rather distinct and deeply held assumptions of their meaning. Moreover, this recognition offers insight into the competence of practice and suggests that competency is a social and relational quality. As the empirical cases made clear, the practical expression of a norm may be self-evident *and* effective for one community, but is a puzzling and counter-productive choice for agents within another.

Following from the above conclusion, substantively this research has unearthed the foundational cognitive and practical qualities of regional relations in each case and shown them to be rather distinct. The qualities of relations that are natural and normal, that work effectively, and that shape conflict management in the two regions under study here are very different. This conclusion presents a complication to many conventional IR perspectives. Rather than particular – Western, liberal, democratic – norms and
communities, this research suggests the possibility that a wide variety of norms, communities, and indeed states may generate peaceful inter-state relations. It is the habituation of particular qualities of interaction that is key to pacific patterns of regional relations and effective conflict management in the perception of those within these communities. Habits of peace vary widely. This general conclusion has implications not only for how to understand myriad paths to ‘long peace’ in these regions and beyond – and the conflictual realities of that peace – but also for how external attempts at crisis response may interact with other practices of peace and security cooperation from other regions or globally.

Distinct habitual practices mean distinct understandings of what each region requires to solve problems or respond to crises, but also what each state therein can and should do in this regard. In South America, the solution was – of course – technocratic expertise to make use of the naturally legalistic processes that undergird regional relations. As one official suggested, “What I think my country needs is very well prepared experts in international law and in the litigation before the International Country of Justice. That is very important. Chile has 23 of the best lawyers in the country for this, and that is what I think my country needs: Trained experts.” However, a Chilean official remarked similarly, suggesting that a major and growing concern was that there was “no luxury of expertise” to be had. A Colombian official lamented similarly: a “weakness of our diplomatic services is politicization. Even through we have excellent people, they have must accept, and often, political appointments.” This was a common refrain: to navigate and support the given and legalist way of doing normal diplomacy in the region, technocratic and skillful professional diplomats with particular competencies was required. In Southeast Asia, there was no expression of this need for expertise, and no lament for a lack of professionalism. Recalling the American official in Jakarta, it is clear that “normal way diplomacy works” in each regional community explains this. In short, different habits shape relations in each region. This is a conclusion
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212 Interview with Chilean official, Washington, October 27, 2014.
213 Interview with Colombian official, Washington, November 14, 2014.
214 Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
that is not likely limited to the regions under consideration here. Rather, this habit-centred framework and attention to the dispositional and inherent practices of inter-state relations are likely to prove useful in advancing understandings of cooperation (and conflict) beyond these cases.

Not only do the implications of this investigation travel beyond the confines of its interest, but the habit- and practice-centred framework developed does as well. This is not to suggest that the empirical conclusions of these cases travel elsewhere per se. As noted, the particularities of conflict management and the foundations of conflictual peace in each of these regions are varied and linked to the cultural and normative foundations, the power within, and historical realities of each context. Rather, it is to suggest that the analytic approach itself can be used to explore the habitual and practical foundations of communities of practitioners elsewhere. The first potential avenue of inquiry is the Western ‘other’ presented in each regional case.

This research has relied upon a common analytical approach to expose and explore two distinct sets of habitual and practical qualities of relations that inform the conflictual reality of these regional cases. In uncovering the existence of discrete habitual qualities of these relations in these two cases, a third was brought into relief: the globally-spread community of European or Western officials interviewed for this research. The self-evident qualities of regional diplomatic practice in each region was brought into relief by the contrasting views of European and North American officials working alongside them. At ASEAN, it was “insane” that procedural informalities would dominate the practice of conflict management. At the OAS, South American legalism was a distinct and “heavy legalism” built on “paper commitments.” In both cases, both European and North American officials dismissed what was known to be self-evident and effective to South American or Southeast Asian officials as not the “normal way diplomacy works” and felt regional practices to be inherently suboptimal to what they knew as normal and
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216 Interview with American official, Washington, November 12, 2014.
efficacious. In so doing, then, the contrasting views explored in the empirical chapters, hint at another distinct self-evident understanding of what diplomatic practice is and should be. This suggestion opens one potential avenue to explore with further research and, in particular, suggests that a disparate and globally-situated community(ies) of European, North American, or Western diplomatic practitioners may exist united by a habitual disposition that places them at odds with other regional communities of practitioners.

Beyond the confines of this research, however there are promising avenues to apply this framework as well. One potential avenue for application is security cooperation and conflict management within the architecture of the African Union (AU). In the following section I quickly underscore the ability of this theoretical framework to travel by offering a brief account of the existence – and not the effects – of a discrete habitual disposition still distinct from those outlined in the previous chapters at the African Union. Further research, mirroring the structure of the empirical chapters here, is required to probe for and document the effects. In this short illustrative case, I aim only to quickly articulate yet another distinct habitual disposition upon which regional relations rest in order to demonstrate the ability of this argument to travel beyond the scope of the preceding investigation.

6.4 The Argument Travels: Habits of Security Cooperation in the African Union

The AU and its responses to regional crises are at the forefront of many of the most pressing international issues (see Moller, 2009). Increasingly, it is African practices, particularly through the AU Peace and Security Council (PSC), that first and most consequentially shape crisis response (see Teiku, 2004; Williams, P., 2009 and 2011; Sturman and Hayatou, 2010; Lotze, 2013). However, the foundational assumptions and unique practices that undergird these reactions have not been systematically studied. While this is symptomatic of IR’s limited engagement with these unreflexive qualities more generally, this gap is all the more apparent in reference to African security practices

217 Interview with American official, Jakarta, July 3, 2014.
as inter-state relations of the region remain relatively understudied in the field. Indeed, the “forgotten continent,” as Rita Abrahamsen and Ray Bush (2003) term it, has been neglected widely in IR. Applying the habit-centred framework is one fruitful means of a corrective that builds on the limited engagement the field has afforded the region (e.g. Engel and Proto, 2010; Lotze, 2013; Vines 2013).

Moreover, a community of practitioners centred around the AU seems a ripe avenue to investigate for distinct habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations. In one of the few detailed accounts of African regional security norms and culture, Paul D. Williams highlights the “central tenets” of African security culture as upholding sovereignty; non-intervention; anti-imperialism; uti possidetis; peaceful settlement of disputes; condemnation of unconstitutional political change; and the AU’s right to intervention under particular circumstances (2007: 261-262). In his account, these are part of the uniquely “African way of doing things” (Legum, 1975, 214 quoted in Williams, P., 2007: 265). As with the previous empirical chapters in this work, the practice of these African norms and principles can be explored to unearth what if any are upheld in practice and the particularities of that practice.

As Walter Lotze explores, the AU relies on external partners for some 60% of its financial contributions and as much as 90% of funding for peace and security programs (2013: 121). One AU official stated with a laugh that, “I am a beggar in chief.” This appraisal was immediately brought into relief during the interview within the PSC headquarters. In a particularly interesting turn of events, partway through the interview his secretary called him away. When he returned he excused himself to make the first of two phone calls to the Danish embassy during our interview. The calls were to request funding for an undisclosed matter concerning flights and accommodations of AU officials. When he finished his second call to the Danes he remarked:
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218 In interviews conducted in 2015 a number of both AU and western officials suggested this dependence had grown to as much as 97% in terms of peace and security operations. In practical terms, this has meant that the AU itself is woefully understaffed. The AU commission in 2012, for example, was staffed by some 669 people, while the EU Commission, on which it is modeled, had 33,000 employees (Vines, 2013: 96; Lotze, 2013: 123).

Listen, why did I just call the Danes? Why did I not call the Nigeria? I needed $100,000. That is pennies for Nigeria. It is for the Danes too. But it is a quick call. I can move with them. But I can’t call the Nigerians. If I called the Nigerians, it would be a big ‘blah, blah, blah’ and hullabaloo. They can buy Lamborghinis, but when we ask for support it’s a hullabaloo. It is a question of values. So I call the Danes.

While there is clearly demand for support, the engagement with donors is puzzling for many Western officials. One such official suggested that the AU is “very insular” and he consistently faces issues of “non-access” despite the technical expertise and financial support provided.\(^{220}\) This was echoed by a European Ambassador who suggested that “non-access” was “a huge problem” that hindered his ability to support and engage the AU, despite the AU’s need for his support.\(^{221}\) As another European official made clear, “they expect our support, that’s clear. But they don’t want us in the room.”\(^{222}\) This reality stems from the imperial legacy. One European official summarized her experience by suggesting “The EU is seen as a colonizer – we’re colonizers, still. Still the rhetoric pops up, as you can see in the Chair’s [Zuma] speeches. You can see it right there. We see it. It is even there in AU-EU dealings outside the public…. we all know the sense is there. We see this history and this reality. It is just something we have to work around, and for will have to for a hundred years to come.” A conversation with two other EU officials suggested much the same: “It is always there. And sometimes – I have been really surprised, but I know we all have experienced it – it is above the surface.”\(^{223}\) From their vantage point, these EU officials recognized what one EU official called “a unifying narrative” borne of “shared experience” with colonialism.\(^{224}\) This common experience served to deny trust and exclude Western participation almost automatically. As she asked, rhetorically, “What else do they share?” This perception was underscored by all European officials I spoke it and highlighted by their description of the institutional reaction to this pervasive reality at the AUC. Two European officials suggested that it was “easier” to gain access if they looked “African”, even if they were clearly coming
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\(^{220}\) Interview with North American officials, Addis Ababa, September 7, 2015.
\(^{221}\) Interview with EU officials, Addis Ababa, September 15, 2015.
\(^{222}\) Interview with German officials, Addis Ababa, September 8, 2015.
\(^{223}\) Interview with EU official, Addis Ababa, September 17, 2015.
\(^{224}\) Interview with EU official, Addis Ababa, September 10, 2015.
from a non-AU member state. Another EU official noted, “It helps to have a Belgian who has Burundi roots.” It was clear to all EU officials that “they don’t want any suggestion or hint of imperialism here.” Combined, this demanding but exclusionary relationship suggested, as one European Ambassador to the AU, phrased it, an “angry dependency, like a teenager who wants the car but doesn’t want to have to ask for the keys.” This was echoed by another EU official who suggested “They are absolutely dependent, but frustrated by it.” Thus, for these European officials, there is an “obvious contradiction” between rhetoric and practice. This perceptive appreciation of the role of this dispositional quality underscores a pervasive dispositional thinking here – thinking from and in this sense against, imperial dependence regardless of the material necessities. This, of course, does not discount the possibility that this unthinking quality of relations can and perhaps is used strategically – highlighted rhetorically to rally support or unify disparate national actors. However, this pragmatic dependency and the push against it manifests in apparent incongruence between principles and practice.

In terms of process, there appear particular dispositional traits at work at the AU. A European ambassador to the AU suggested that African officials at the AU tended to be “spontaneous” in a way that is “not normal for diplomacy.” The Ambassador offered an example. During the 2014 AU-EU Summit it was to his “complete surprise [that] the PSC spontaneously boycotted”. According to him, this was puzzling to him, as it was clear that it “was not in the interest of their national governments” and was something that “simply would not happen in Europe, of course.” Indeed, this abnormal quality of relations meant that, according to one European official the AU “is a funny place” while two European other interviewees simply described the working of the AUC as
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228 Interview with European Ambassador, Addis Ababa, September 9, 2015.
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230 Interview with German officials, Addis Ababa, September 8, 2015.
231 Interview with European official, Addis Ababa, 2015. Details of nationality and dates removed to ensure anonymity.
“nightmare.” Many European interviews were quick to contrast their experience at the EU with their time at the AU. In the words of one official, “The EU is based very much on laws. We just don’t have it here. Not at all. Period.” A European military advisor to the AU echoed these assumptions and dismissively summarized her experiences at the AU by suggesting that “It is just a body to come together and to understand. It brings people together, and nothing really else. Just a process. This is good but it has limits.”

This dependence and the character of AU cooperation can be glimpsed by the tension between the principle of ‘African solutions to African problems’ and regional security cooperation in practice. Since its founding, the AU has actively sought to address regional crises itself, abhoring the imperial engagement that gave rise its predecessor. This principle is the core raison d’être of the AU and one inherent in the 2000 Constitutive Act. Therein, the core interest of the AU as an organization was to “promote peace, security and stability on the continent” (3.f), and one which declared that “the Union had a right to intervene in a Member State pursuant to a decision of the Assembly in respect of grave circumstances, namely war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity” in order to make it so (4.h). In interviewing AU practitioners, this is a much lauded and natural quality of relations apparent. An interview with PSC official made this clear: “I believe in African Solutions to African problems. This is over here. This is our neighbourhood. You can study the region. You can study culture. You can study what you like. But it is not the same. Only we can find real solutions. Only we can give the solutions we need. Libya shows this! We had a roadmap. They ignored us. And now look: they are crying like babies with the migrants.” AU practitioners know regional problems require regional solutions. However, in practice, and even beyond a reliance on the UN to fund African peacekeeping operations (e.g. Burundi 2003-2004, Sudan 2004-present), the continent has continually relied upon former colonial oppressors in a variety

233 Interview with German officials, Addis Ababa, September 8, 2015; Interview with European officials, Addis Ababa, September 17, 2015.
234 Interview with EU official, Addis Ababa, September 10, 2015.
235 Interview with EU officials, Addis Ababa, September 15, 2015.
236 Interview with AU official, Addis Ababa, September 16, 2015.
of contexts with practical effects. As one European official noted, “African problems are too big” for African solutions. As he continued, African solutions suggest “the idea of the solution, but not entirely its operation.” Similarly, another EU official suggested African solutions to African problems was “somewhere between ambitious and hubristic, in reality.” The AMISOM mission is a case in point. As an EU official summarized,

AMISOM was not really an AU mission. There are very few member states who contribute troops and the AU has played very little in terms of a logistical role or capacity. It is reliance on the UN and the EU. Their boots are on the ground, which is better than ours, but that is the limit of the African solution… Let’s be honest. They don’t put their money where their mouth is… They must wake up.

This was not lost on AU practitioners either. One PSC official made this clear with her discussion of the AMISOM mission as one of many exhibiting the same reality: “We do the dying. It is always, ‘you Africans go and die, and we will come and stabilize.’… This is the UN: to make a mission, without a mission.” The same sentiment came from an AU state representative at the Commission who suggested that AMISOM showed the AU only that “They pay us to die.” This reality, and the divorce between AU norms and principles and the gulf between thinking of AU practitioners and those of their European and Western supporters suggests that particular habits of regional security cooperation may be at work, shaping both regional practitioners respond to regional crises and how they engage with donors themselves. In these accounts there appear incongruence
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237 The first usage of an African solution to African problems, or the “Try OAU First” principle came in 1963 with the near-decade old dispute between Algeria and Morocco (see Henrikson, 1995).
238 Also from an external vantage point, Paul Williams observes that patterns in security cooperation even prior to the AU, indicted a practice removed from the aspirational norm. As he observes, for example in 1964 Kenya, Tanganyika, and Uganda called on Britain, their former colonial oppressor, to quell munities among their militaries. Congo has done the same, and the OAU itself did so with British intervention in Rhodesia and French intervention in the Central African Republic (2007: 270).
239 Interview with German officials, Addis Ababa, September 8, 2015.
240 Interview with European Ambassador, Addis Ababa, September 9, 2015. Across four interviews, European officials suggested the case of African migration issues underscored this reality. As the Ambassador quoted here noted, “There is one single person at the AU working on migration. Can you imagine that? How can you engage with that? They are fine with frameworks, but we cannot look to the AU for implementation.” As he continued, this extended beyond the issue of migration as “There are reams of agreements signed by the 54 [member states] still unimplemented and largely unknown… That is the style that suits them best.” Interview with European Ambassador, Addis Ababa, September 9, 2015.
241 Interview with EU official, Addis Ababa, September 11, 2015.
243 Interview with AU member state official, Addis Ababa, September 17, 2015.
between norms and practice. For European and other partner states, there are ineffective policies and thinking that appear entrenched, while these realities appear given for AU practitioners.

As with the previous empirical cases, however, this does not suggest the AU and the PSC have been ineffective, particularly in the estimations of AU officials. Indeed, as one AU official suggested, practitioners assume in the sense of states being able to meet regularly, to function efficiently and see members respond [to regional crises]. Of course, we could do better. It [the PSC] is limited to political agenda setting now… The point is the number of discussions and the issues. Look at what comes one year to the next. Look at all the issues that see decisions taken, and look at the follow up mechanisms… Look even at four months of the PSC, at all the critical issues addressed and decisions taken. This shows you they are functioning.²⁴⁴

As with the previous explorations, here there are assumptions of the competency and efficaciousness of AU practices that appear at odds with practices and thinking external to the region. To understand the particularities of AU regional responses to crises and the particularities of their response do and engagement with Western donors on whom they are so dependent, a habit- and practice-centred may be of analytic utility.

This quick exploration is indeed a preliminary one, and highlights only the potential existence of yet another habitual dispositions of regional relations and conflict management within this community. Again there is a clear divide in perceptions between practice and its congruence to codified norms and principles between intra-regional practitioners and those external to the region working alongside it. Moreover, this particular and dispositional thinking is likely informed by the weak and illiberal ‘quasi states’ of the region (i.e. Jackson and Roseberg, 1982; Jackson, 1991; Buzan and Weaver, 2003; Fawn, 2009) their experiences with conflict within and between them (see Reno, 2011; Straus, 2011). Indeed, and rather uniquely, many AU member governments operate in environments of extreme political contestation to their function and legitimacy (McGowan, 2003; Conelissen et al., 2012; Paul, 2012; Vines, 2013; Death, 2015). Moreover, the shared and recent experience with colonialism may have given rise to a

²⁴⁴ Interview with AU official, Addis Ababa, September 10, 2015.
distinct and common disposition within the community of AU practitioners. As Paul D. Williams observes, “African states and organizations think about and practice security is intimately related to how they understand their self-image(s) and what it means to be ‘African’. At present, the AU is arguably the most important crucible in which such debates take place.” In this way, Africa – like Southeast Asia and South America – is a ‘cognitive region’ or field wherein practitioners recognize themselves as part of a particular (African) international society (Adler, 1997; and see Williams, P., 2007: 260-261).

6.5 Conclusions

Inter-state cooperation and peace are defined not merely the absence of war. Peace is a process. It is the quality of iterated, if mundane, relations between states. It exists when non-violent means of conflict management and of regional relations more generally, become the unthinking means of interaction. The characteristics of these interactions – the habitual and dispositional qualities of regional relations – inform both the existence and particularities of regional peace. In this way, the distinctive habitual and dispositional qualities that shape inter-state interactions of conflict management may be near, proximate causes of patterns of conflictual peace.

This research has uncovered that different regional communities of practitioners exhibit different understandings of codified norms and different communities practice them in distinct ways. It has highlighted is most consequential for regional crisis response and regionalism more generally are the cognitive and practical habits of relations, and not the material power of members, their state interdependence, or abstract and codified norms of behaviour. In this way, it is the habitual dispositions of regional relations that allow us to understand how different regions of states are able to build relative and lasting peace despite pervasive territorial disputes.

In Europe, particular habits may have been productive of a classical security community, but elsewhere in the Global South, distinctive habits have informed particular patterns of conflict and cooperation. In Southeast Asia, for example, cooperation rests on habitual
practices of informal consensus building and an automatic rejection of formal dispute mechanisms, even those codified within ASEAN itself. Regional diplomatic practitioners view inter-state conflict with a ‘business as usual’ disposition that informs a tolerance for limited regional conflict. This habitual recourse to informality and slow consensus building restricted the escalation of the bloody Thai-Cambodian Preah Vihear border dispute in 2011, but also prolonged it and hindered its formal resolution. While Southeast Asian officials know that a turn to informality and particular consensus-seeking practices are the normal way that diplomacy and conflict management work, it is at odds with the dispositions and practices of their European counterparts working alongside the ASEAN Secretariat. Across the Pacific, South American practitioners automatically think from the context of legal obligation and axiomatically turn to practices of formal arbitration of disputes – divergent practices from those of Southeast Asia despite similarly pacific regional trends. However, unlike the European traditions on which these practices are founded, South American quasi-legal habits are largely absent an institutionalized multilateral forum, reliant instead on deeply internalized assumptions of procedural formality as a result of a shared cultural heritage. It is from this foundation that regional practitioners respond to crises, such as the 1995 Cenepa ‘War’, and continue to pursue deeper integration through the nascent Union of South American Nations (UNASUR). While South American officials know that a particular brand of legalistic practice works for them and generates the pacific realities of their regional relations, it is puzzlingly suboptimal for their North American counterparts at the OAS. In both regional cases, unique diplomatic habits circumscribe crisis response and shape regionalism more generally.
References


“ASEAN Secretary-General Cites Progress in Thai-Cambodian Resolution,” *Jakarta Post*, May 5, 2011.


Fawn, Rick (2009), “‘Regions’ and their study: wherefrom, what for and whereto?” *Review of International Studies* 35(S1): pp. 5-34.


