

The Ecuador Peru Peace Process:

A study of discursive exclusion and ideological interference in assessment
material and academic literature

By

Jason Zachidniak

Thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in the Faculty of Human Sciences

Department of Human Sciences

Conflict Studies

Saint Paul University

Summer 2019

© Jason Zachidniak, Ottawa, Canada, 2020

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	page... 6
Research questions	7
Argumentation	12
Chapter 2: History/Background/Outcomes	17
Origins of violence	17
Rio Protocol mandates Multi-party mediation	20
Escalation of violence after Rio Protocol	21
Peace of Itamaracy	26
Conclusion of history & problematizing political claims	29
The subaltern narrative	30
Political settlements – Legal Outcomes of the EPPP	41
Chapter 3: Methods	43
Narrative Mediation	44
Discourse Analysis	46
Critical Discourse Analysis	52
Framing Bias	56
Chapter 4: Data & Analysis	63
Narrative Mediation	63
The comprehensive settlements, a brief analysis	71
Discourse Analysis	77
Critical Discourse Analysis	88
Framing Bias	99
Chapter 5: Synthesis	107
Works Cited	117

Abstract : Discursive study: the Ecuador Peru Peace Process (EPPP): Realist Ritual & Sacrifice

The EPPP is an example of a contemporary international conflict transformation where mediators successfully de-escalated interstate violence. This paper examines functions and structures of the assessment discourse during the 1995-1998 multiparty mediator interventions.

Several sources attribute the outcome of the EPPP to impacts of mediator leveraging yet these assessments lack crucial data. The research explores mediator bridging and questions why this form of intervention is not addressed in Realist discourse. This work considers how bridging presents challenges for Realist assessment criteria. Tracing the patterned exclusion of data this research investigates power asymmetries and bias and the influence of ideology.

Mediator Intra-group conflict is examined through critical discourse analysis. This framework informs an inquiry into discursive structures and functions while exploring hegemony. The project considers subaltern data sets, obscured by Realists. The project examines positionality and questions Realist assumptions. Worldview challenges and threats are considered and EPPP texts are interpreted as collective representations of prejudice and avoidance. This approach examines structures of domination and the subordination of groups and data. The research considers systems and structures of language “in terms of binary oppositions that establish relationships of power through the privileging of one element in the binary.”

Discourse is examined as competition and power is traced through the circulation process. A genealogical approach to discourse analysis investigates “ruptures and breaks”

interrogating the silent “marginalized voices and subjugated knowledge.” The research aims to map, and layer discourses within the EPPP multiparty mediator discourse sample.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Professor Anna Sheftel. Professor Sheftel’s continued and steadfast guidance, support and feedback have sustained this project. Her consistent patience and backing of this inquiry have reinforced my efforts during the challenges that this thesis provided. Thank you as always for your kind rapport and your pedagogic approach.

I would also like to thank my partner, Laurence. Thank you Laurence for your consistent patience with me and with this project. Countless times you have kept the family operational while I struggled to complete this project and my studies. These accomplishments would not have been possible without the support and contributions that you provided.

Finally, I would like to thank my children, Aube and Luan. Aube’s excursions to the playground and pool have provided the necessary balancing in my priorities and Luan’s birth has propelled me to rise to my potential and continue my flourishing. Thank you Aube and Luan.

List of Abbreviations

CDA - Critical Discourse Analysis

COICA -La Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indigenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

CONAIE – Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador

CPPB - conflict prevention and peace-building

DMZ – Demilitarized zone

EPPP - Ecuador Peru Peace Process

MOMEPE – Military Observer Mission Ecuador Peru

NM – Narrative Mediation

PCI – Post Conflict Intervention

T&T - Trajfel & Turner

Chapter 1: Introduction

The 1995 to 1998 Ecuador Peru Peace Process (EPPP) is a fascinating and complex case study of a recent and successful international effort to build and sustain inter-nation-state peace through multi-party and multi-track mediation. The EPPP is a relevant case study of the transformation of contemporary inter-nation-state conflict centered on the issue of land claims and border disputes. Multi-party mediators and multi-track mediation channels successfully combined the top-down and bottom-up mediation efforts to transform the border conflict between Ecuador and Peru. Institutional diplomats mediating through top-down channels combined with non-institutional mediators and grass-roots collectives applying bottom-up methods. Both forms of mediation impacted the EPPP. These multiple mediation forms and actors combined their efforts to de-escalate this case of contemporary interstate violence. This inquiry has collected the academic literature on the EPPP and examines discursive structures and functions that have emerged in the discourse of the archive of the EPPP. This inquiry specifically attends to emergent discursive structures in Post Conflict Intervention (PCI) assessment/evaluative claims in the literature about the 1995-1998 multiparty/track mediator interventions and interactions.

This thesis argues that the [English language](#) academic community, to date, has produced conflicted and flawed assessment discourse about the EPPP in their endeavors to qualify, measure and assess the forms of mediation that

impacted the EPPP. My paper demonstrates the hegemony of the political realist perspective in [the English language](#) academic attempts to identify and assesses the causes of this contemporary and important historic transition from violence to peace between the nation-states Ecuador and Peru. [This thesis does not refer to any Spanish language academic assessments therefore, it only comments on the academic literature produced for English language consumption. This absence of analysis of Spanish language academic assessment material clearly impacts this thesis's review of academic discourse. Nevertheless, the hegemony of the political realist perspective in the English language academic assessments is prevalent and this thesis focuses on and only examines this prevalence.](#) The Stanford encyclopedia of Philosophy states, "Realism, also known as political realism, is a view of international politics that stresses its competitive and conflictual side" (Korab-Karpowicz 2018). This theoretical orientation contains assumptions about the nature of conflict, namely that the accumulation of power and force are essential to the overcoming any international conflict. This paper argues that the embedded assumption in realism adversely affects its' adherents capacity to neutrally assess conflict outcomes.

This chapter also states the research questions and the arguments of this study.

Research Questions

Researching the impacts of mediation as an effective intervention in the Ecuador Peru Peace Process (EPPP), this inquiry observes commonalities between academics from the Political Science and International Relations disciplines. Notwithstanding the impact of a common ideology/theoretical orientation based in Political Realism, academics from these disciplines tend to

exclusively analyze the political institutional channels and actors active during the EPPP. Moreover, their assessments function to legitimize these actors and processes. The academics from the International Relations discipline exhibited a tendency to assess and attribute the successful outcome of the EPPP to the impact of one form/type of mediation in the Post Conflict Intervention (PCI) literature in the EPPP archive.

Although these mediation forms had different names stemming from different typologies: *Manipulation* in the Wilkenfeld, Young, Quinn and Asal study and *Leveraging* in Crocker, Hampson and Aall's study, these mediation forms shared very similar qualities. Both manipulative mediation and leveraging in mediation were assessed as the contributing and most impactful factor to a successful outcome in the EPPP in these respective studies.

Wilkenfeld et al. define the manipulation form of mediation as "manipulation of the parties through threat or rewards" (Wilkenfeld 2005). Crocker et al. define the leveraging form of mediation as "develop(ing) some type of base of power to become interesting and helpful to the conflict parties" (C. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 2015a). Both these forms of mediation share the common quality; the mediator exerts power/or forces the conflict actors to behave in a certain way. Both studies suggest that the successful outcome of the EPPP is a direct result of the third party mediator's application of power/force on the conflict actors.

Frequently the PCI assessments on the EPPP in the academic literature in this inquiry's EPPP archive highlight the institutional mediators' application of external political power/force via Track I diplomatic channels. These

assessments claim that the institutional application of Track I power/force was the instrumental cause of the successful outcome of the EPPP. This inquiry expands on Emery Brusset's work in Measuring What Matters in Peace Operations & Crisis Management. This paper intends to reveal the complexities involved with impact assessment. Emery Brusset writes, "The essence of the international community's evaluation methodology for conflict prevention and peace-building programming (CPPB) focus on cause/effect relationships in order to create ideal conditions for peace"(Meharg 2009, 189). Brusset succinctly claims, "The ability to attribute... cause and effect relationships remains a myth" (Ibid, 199). Brusset identifies the challenges associated with causality claims interrogating the "attribution problem: How can we prove that a change in the status of peace and conflict can be traced back to a specific intervention in the project?"(Ibid, 190). This attribution problem is referred to also as "the black box" in impact evaluations (Ibid, 193). Essentially, this black box contains all the complexities of the unknowable inputs, which multiple approaches and analyses draw out. These complexities, Brusset suggests, reveal the myth of cause and effect: "The black box decreases the validity of many methods of evaluations"(Ibid, 193). Moreover, Brusset claims that attempts to attribute cause and effect in PCI are "narrative(s), highly contentious explanation(s) of the conflict. It is relatively easy for a critical reviewer of the evaluation to question the validity of the interpretation, and it is even more difficult for the evaluator to defend this validity" (Ibid, 191). This inquiry, building on Brusset's comments, attempts to unpack the political realist claims of attribution on the EPPP.

The EPPP archive identifies that the leveraging/manipulation forms of mediation were not the only forms of mediation operational during the entirety

of the EPPP. The EPPP archive also refers to others who intervened as Track II/ non- institutional mediators in addition to instances of Track III/grass roots channels/actors of mediation. Under careful analysis, the archive subtly reveals that these other forms of mediation were also operational and employed in the EPPP by other agents and that these other forms of mediation were in fact impactful to the outcomes of the EPPP. These other forms of mediation and other actors/agents were active and operational during the EPPP, yet these others receive very little attention and infrequent analysis in the majority of the frameworks in the academic literature on the EPPP. Several authoritative works on the EPPP reference and rely on only one participant mediator's narrative as a source of information about the confidential mediation events of the EPPP. Knowing that the EPPP was a multiparty mediation process, I attempted to collect and archive the English language narratives and data from these other mediators who are frequently excluded in the frameworks of political assessments.

Exploring the other narratives/assessments of the EPPP and integrating these others within the archive, a hierarchical status of these texts emerged. The political frames and assessments are more frequent and accessible and circulate freely in academic sources such as the library and journals. These political frames and assessments emerge as hegemonic in their positioning in the EPPP archive. The other frames and assessments are less frequent and accessible. These other frames and assessments do not freely circulate in academic sources and emerge as subaltern in positioning. With the academic literature's tendency to exclude a full analysis on the impact of Track II/III actors and channels and a tendency to rely on only one participants narrative, I detected a possibility of

bias emerging in the assessments of the EPPP in the archive and continued to interrogate the works of those authors who had assessed the EPPP as having a successful outcome due to the impact of leveraging/manipulation form of mediation. My inquiry began to question the impact of frameworks, biases and ideology on assessment/evaluative literature.

My inquiry questioned: Had these authors considered how their source's bias and ideology could impact their source's assessment of the EPPP? Had these authors reflexively considered how their own bias and/or ideology could impact their framing of the successful outcome of the EPPP? The emergence of bias in a historical material dataset and the impact of ideology in academia is limiting for students and future researchers. The EPPP is not only an excellent case study of applied mediation which merits a detailed examination, but also examining discursive structures and how the discourse about the EPPP functions, offers the conflict analyst an opportunity to mediate assessments and redress asymmetries of attribution that have emerged in the academic discourse.

To this effect, this inquiry attempts to respond to these general questions; How does ideology/bias shape academic understanding of a Conflict Transformation process? Why/How does academic literature on the EPPP exclude others. Both Johan Galtung, acting as a Track II non-institutional mediator and Indigenous collectives such as The Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) acting as Track III/grass-roots mediators intervened in the EPPP. This inquiry argues that one crucial legal-political outcome of the EPPP, the bi-national zone, originated because of the contributions of these other mediators. This inquiry is also guided by a set of sub questions; What forms of mediation were operational during the EPPP and

how did they function? How to qualify these mediator techniques/methods?
When did mediators first employ each form? How did the multiple mediation
methods impact the EPPP? Who is doing Post-Conflict Intervention
evaluations/assessments of the EPPP? What are the assessors'
positions/biases/ideologies? What is the assessors' academic background/
discipline?

Argumentation

This study posits that academics informed by the Political Realist
ideology/theoretical orientation form the core of the In-Group in
assessment/evaluative literature producers and their discourse exhibits
competitive behavior by excluding the impact of others. By analyzing the In-
Group's discourse, this inquiry detects and demonstrates how this bias/ideology
adversely affects the EPPP PCI literature. This inquiry demonstrates how
political frameworks, in this case study, exclusively analyze institutional power
relations and this narrow scope excludes the emergence of the impact of other
modes of interventions/interactions. The hegemonic framework produces a
limited historical dataset and a faulty discursive structure in the archive. The
hegemonic framework functions to misinform future researchers/ mediators/
interveners who are interested in dually examining the outcomes of the EPPP
and the functions and forms of mediation active in the EPPP.

This inquiry argues that patterned exclusion of subaltern data can be
traced in the EPPP literature. This study assumes that political researchers in
this case, share a common and collective ideology and this study argues that the
political bias/ideology adversely impacts academic assessments of the EPPP.
This study claims that ideology has a powerful effect/impact on the

understanding of conflict transformation processes. A researcher's ideology effects his/her assessments in a negative way. A researcher's ideology may cause him/her to exclude and avoid certain data in order to substantiate the research's claims. When research is examined as a product of group behavior/cognitive process and these flawed claims are repeated and patterned in the discourse, the data that was excluded becomes silenced and erased over time.

This exclusion of data resembles similar behavioral and cognitive processes explored in Social Identity frameworks such as those developed by Trajfel & Turner. In addition to the T&T study, the relational patterns exhibited in the PCI literature of the EPPP archive resembles similar cognitive and behavioral patterns explored in worldview frameworks developed by Golpen and Plant. Golpen and Plant define worldview as "an individual's subjective beliefs and assumptions about reality and his or her existence within that reality" (Golpen and Plant, 1474-75). These authors claim that an individual's worldview has several significant impacts. It influences an individual's "decisions and interpretations of (their) experiences" (Ibid, 1474). The authors suggest that an individual's worldview influences his/her psychological processes by claiming, "A person's worldview directly affects his or her cognition, motivation, behavior, and relationships with the world and other people" (Ibid, 1475). Not only does a worldview have a myriad of effects upon an individual, but it also has several functions such as "imbuing the world with meaning and order to create feelings of predictability, certainty, and self-worth" (Ibid, 1475). These authors believe that individuals rely on their worldview to the extent that a challenge or contradiction or a "disconfirmation" of that

worldview has “life-transforming or even catastrophic” effects (Ibid, 1475).

Identifying this process as a “worldview threat”, the authors developed a study to examine “cognitive processes and behaviors” in response to worldview threats. These include: “avoidance of others, prejudice or discrimination to worldview violators” and in certain cases, the advocacy of violence. The authors’ studies demonstrate how individuals are “motivated to maintain their worldviews and will avoid, derogate, and even aggress against others” (Ibid, 1475).

This inquiry examines Ideology as functioning similarly to worldview. Political realism is a school of thought that informs its’ adherents with basic assumptions and normative beliefs and values about conflict and conflict intervention, namely the desire of a nation-state to accumulate power/force. As a school of thought, political realism contains a theoretical orientation that normalizes the accumulation of power. In the way that political realism normalizes and values the accumulation of nation-state power, it is similar to ideology. In the way that political realism includes subjective beliefs and assumptions, it is similar to a worldview. Drawing on mediation scholarship and questions of neutrality, this paper agrees with claims such as “neutrality is an illusion: there is no such thing as a detached or neutral observer...we are all advocates of something, all of the time whether we are conscious of it or not” (Dyck, 141). Also taking a cue from frameworks that criticize conflict resolution frameworks, this paper explores how “societal discourse is frequently controlled by elites who can inhibit an official power analysis” (Hansen, 408). Hansen suggests that mediation scholarship and practice may “be artificially narrowed in the field of Conflict Resolution stifling potential opportunities for tension and

debate” (Ibid, 411). In advocating for a clear and central power analysis in mediation scholarship, Hansen claims, “Conflict Resolution can be enriched with more attention placed on power analysis, power balancing, and the attainment of sustainable resolutions that resist social injustice and oppression” (Ibid, 423).

This study argues that political realist ideology/worldview adversely affects political assessments of the EPPP, specifically their choice of measurements. Political measurements of power are flawed in the case of the EPPP archive because these measurements exclusively examine institutional/structural top-down exertion of power in the EPPP. Political measurements of hard power could be improved with the consideration and inclusion of other measurements of social interaction and soft power. In the case of the EPPP, frameworks of analysis must also consider and include the momentum generated by the non-institutional actors, bottom-up/grass-roots and Track II contributions to the outcome of the EPPP. This inquiry claims that a researcher’s ideology, similar to his/her worldview can impact the conclusions of his/her study. In the case of the EPPP, the bi-national zone component of the final political settlements of the EPPP represents a “worldview threat” to political realist researchers and their assessment material on the outcomes of the EPPP exhibits discursive avoidant and discriminatory behavior.

This thesis intends to demonstrate the patterned exclusion of others in the academic assessment literature. [This thesis takes a post-positivist position; a neutral assessment of a mediation process is challenging as a result of the evaluator’s bias towards certain data. This paper intends to expose how Political Realists’ biased discourse operates in the EPPP archive.](#) The thesis draws on four methods to examine the EPPP archive. Narrative Mediation is used to

deconstruct the EPPP narratives and redress asymmetries in the attribution problematic in the academic narrative of the EPPP. Discourse Analysis examines the structures and positionality of the discourse and its circulators. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) examines genealogical aspects of discourse, identifying the intertextualities. Genealogy confirms the monumental influence and impact of Luigi Einaudi's discourse on the academic literature. By cross-examining the bibliographies and references, CDA demonstrates how the researchers sourced their materials resulting in a biased dataset. Framing Bias suggests that ideology, like worldview, significantly impacts both the presentation and the circulation of data.

Chapter one outlines the history of the Ecuador and Peru conflict. The background to the conflict and the peace process are explained in detail. Chapter one also details the political-legal outcomes that signal the transformation of this conflict. Chapter two describes the four methods of analysis that this thesis draws on in its analysis of the EPPP archive. Chapter three discusses the resulting data and analysis of each of the four methods discussed in chapter three. Chapter four is a synthesis and discusses the conclusions of this study.

Chapter 2:

Background – History and Outcomes

Introduction

This chapter explores the history of the Ecuador and Peru conflict identifying the repeated attempts of mediation to transform the status of the land claimed by these two nations. This chapter will also detail the roots of the border dispute and specify the political outcomes of the EPPP as these outcomes were agreed to in the 1998 final settlements under the Presidential Act of Brasilia. The history of this conflict reveals repeated attempts and subsequent failures of institutional leveraging/manipulation. In detailing the history of this conflict, this inquiry intends to demonstrate that alternative forms/sources of mediation impacted the transformation of the Ecuador Peru border dispute in the 1995-1998 EPPP, and trace how these alternative modes of mediation are excluded or erased in certain academic evaluations collected in the EPPP archive.

Origins of violence

The boundary dispute between Ecuador and Peru was the longest running border conflict in the American continents until its conclusion in 1998. Dating to the early 1800s, international-state violence had continually re-escalated over the issue of an unresolved border demarcated between the two nations. Dating to the early 1700s, the origins of the land dispute can be traced to Spain's colonial impact. Palmer's historical narrative relays, "The Peru-Ecuador boundary issue is the oldest continuing border dispute in the Western

Hemisphere cause(ing) more trouble than any other in America...baffl[ing] repeated attempts at...negotiated settlement and repeated efforts at mediation on the part of other friendly nations”(Ibid, 109). Palmer identifies origins of this border conflict and traces them back to the boundaries that Spanish colonial administrators designated. First the Viceroyalty of Peru, and then in 1717, the new Viceroyalty of Nueva Granada administered the colonial territories, which were later to become the nation-states Peru and Ecuador (Ibid, 116).

The exact location of the border was not important for hundreds of years, being far from colonial capital cities and deep in the Amazonian forested highlands. Palmer states, “The precise delineation of boundary lines appeared to be unnecessary and was not undertaken”(Ibid, 116). In the case of the boundary between Ecuador and Peru, political events intensified the issue of an “ill-defined” border. Palmer writes, “first, by changes in the colonial administration that served to separate Ecuador from Peru, and second, by Ecuador’s post-independence succession (1830) from the Confederation of Nueva Granada” (Ibid, 117).

The Ecuador and Peru border conflict includes a history of interventions. Prominent third party nation-states have attempted multiple forms of mediation. Palmer writes, “Efforts to get the border sorted out go back to at least 1802 and include, over the years prior to the 1941 war, and 1942 Rio Protocol, thirteen major initiatives...each time an initiative was proposed it failed”(Ibid, 117). He suggests that throughout the history of this border dispute, both nation-states have tried to resolve it by third party mediation or arbitration (Ibid, 118). Identifying the prominent and frequent third parties, he writes, “the United States and Spain have been the preferred outsiders” (Ibid, 118). Five occasions,

prior to 1942, the U.S. had offered its help to resolve the conflict in response to an initiative by Ecuador or Peru; 1827, 1910, 1924, 1934, 1936-38 (Ibid, 118). Spain, another prominent third party has offered its help to resolve the border issue. Palmer claims, "Spain had been engaged in similar activities with the same lack of success"(Ibid, 118). Palmer's historical material suggests that the Ecuador Peru border dispute was intractable with a history of attempts to resolve it.

Luigi R. Einaudi also provides a similar and concise summary of the background of the Ecuador-Peru conflict. He traces the origins of the dispute to "a struggle for control over South America's vast and largely unknown Amazon interior that followed the end of the Spanish empire" (C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999a, 408). New nation-states Ecuador and Peru disputed over the sovereignty over some three hundred fifty thousand square kilometers – an area the size of France or Spain. Sovereignty played an important role in the land dispute and the absence of sovereignty played an important role in the transformation of the border dispute. The legal instrument *uti possedetis de jure* produced what Robert Jackson has referred to as *negative sovereignty*, "the legal entitlement to rule a territory without the material and institutional capabilities to exercise that right" (Herz and Nogueira 2002, 24). The disassembly of this legal instrument will be discussed in the following chapters, yet it is important to introduce here. Einaudi writes, "The century following independence saw little settlement but much military and diplomatic activity. The king of Spain and the president of the United States attempted to act as arbiters. No agreed boundary emerged" (C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999a, 408). Each attempt at resolution failed resulting in "layers of mutual distrust" for the conflict actors

and this distrust “made it seem as if each country were writing its history as an ‘anti-history’ of its neighbor”(Ibid, 408).

Rio Protocol mandates Multi-party mediation

Nation-states Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and the U.S. collectively engaged the Peru-Ecuador conflict actors during a short war over the border in 1941 and became guarantors of the international treaty that ended the 1941 violence. Einaudi writes of the 1941 war, “ the Ecuadoran army collapsed and Peru occupied southern Ecuador”(Ibid, 408). The result of this 1941 violence was the Rio Protocol. This internationally recognized treaty played an important role in the future relations and interactions of Ecuador and Peru with respect to their border conflict. The treaty created a pivotal and critical political-legal framework, which assisted Ecuador and Peru in defining the issues in their conflict and the process of agreement itself (Ibid, 408). Article 9 of the Rio Protocol stipulates, “...the parties may...grant such reciprocal concessions as they may consider advisable in order to adjust the...line to geographical realities”. The document then goes on to say “these rectifications should be made with the collaboration of the representatives of the United State of America, the Argentine Republic, Brazil and Chile”(Palmer 1997,112).

The Rio Protocol states that the decision-making on demarcating the border is to be made by Peru and Ecuador but that the decision should be made collaboratively with the guarantors of the treaty. Palmer’s legal analysis succinctly states, “Peru and Ecuador, as the parties to the conflict, are denoted as the powers that are ultimately responsible for its resolution, but the obligation of

the guarantors to assist is also, and equally explicit" (Ibid, 112). The Rio Protocol contains "the legal provisions necessary to arrive at a solution" to which Ecuador and Peru could ultimately agree (Ibid, 112). This study proceeds to focus on the de-escalation of the 1994/95 violence and the mediation efforts that transformed this conflict.

Why did violence escalate after Rio Protocol?

With Articles V, VII, and IX of the Rio Protocol "committing the guarantors to help settle disagreements 'until the definitive demarcation of frontiers between Peru and Ecuador has been completed'", this inquiry questioned: why and how did violence escalate after the 1942 Rio Protocol? (C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999, 409). Einaudi writes, "Over the next six years, a Mixed Ecuadoran-Peruvian Demarcation Commission worked with the assistance of guarantor experts to fix the boundary on the ground"(Ibid 409).

In 1948, with border markers in place "among more than 90 percent of the border" Ecuador decided to discontinue its work with the commission based on new geographic information. A 1946 U.S. Army Air Force aerial survey of the disputed border territory identified two watersheds in the Amazonian highlands. Ecuador argued that its "framers of the (rio) protocol had believed only one existed" (Ibid, 409). Ecuador asserted that this "new geographic reality made the protocol '*inejecutable*' (impossible to implement)" and it promptly withdrew from the Mixed Commission putting an end to the border demarcation process (Ibid, 409).

Twelve years later Ecuador again asserted that the 'geographic error' made the Rio Protocol "invalid as well as unworkable." However, the guarantors "rejected the thesis of nullity: under international law, boundary treaties cannot

be renounced by a single party” (Ibid, 409). Peru’s response was denial that any issue existed. Peru employed its superior military to enforce the disputed border as though it had been completely marked “where Peru’s experts (and unofficially most guarantor experts) believed it should go, along the Cordillera del Condor and the watershed between the Cenepa and Coangos Rivers” (Ibid, 409).

Ecuadoran military patrols frequently crossed the border and were asked to withdraw when detected by Peru’s patrols, “accepting the reason of force if not the protocol” (Ibid, 409). Violence was infrequent in the Ecuador-Peru system until “clashes in 1981 and 1991 sparked momentary interest, which quickly evaporated once forces were separated” (Ibid 410).

However, in January 1995, the militaries of both Ecuador and Peru escalated troops and resources to the disputed land in the upper valley of the Cenepa to possess the land, asserting positive sovereignty. This violence differed distinctly from the violence in the 1941 outbreak. Whereas in 1941, the conflict actors used “machetes and turn-of-the-century mausers”, in 1995, “the two militaries were engaging with jets and rockets” (Ibid 410). Both countries mobilized air forces, armored units and navies. The populations of Ecuador and Peru feared military escalation to more heavily populated areas. (Ibid 410).

Palmer’s research offers more in-depth military details:

“The precipitant factor for the outbreak of serious hostilities between Ecuador and Peru in 1995, was Ecuador’s gradual redeployment of military units, beginning in 1991, into the disputed territory ...these military units constructed three heavily fortified bases on high ground in the area of Tiwintza...complete with significant artillery

emplacements and protected with thousands of land mines”(Palmer, 1997 119).

The desire to possess the territory of Tiwintza is directly addressed in the final political settlement of the EPPP, the Presidential Act of Brasilia. The transition in the legal status of Tiwintza is one of the three significant components of the legal-political outcomes of the EPPP. The origins of this component of the final settlement are frequently discussed and disputed amongst the researchers in the hegemonic position of the EPPP archive. Palmer suggests that while Peru was aware of the Ecuadorian military deployment, “no effort was made to respond” these movements until late 1994. Local Peruvian patrols paid ‘friendly’ visits to the Ecuadoran outposts in Tiwintza to warn and advise they withdraw (Ibid 119). The Ecuadorean forces did not respond to the ‘friendly’ warnings by Peruvian forces. Eventually the local Peruvian forces began military maneuvers; “probing, in December 1994 and early January 1995; and then, by rushing into a confrontation in the jungle for which they turned out to be ill prepared” (Ibid 119). The Peruvian forces, outnumbered and under supplied, suffered casualties and withdrew (26 January 1995). As a result, Peru mobilized its forces in response and confronted the already mobilized Ecuadorean military (Ibid 119).

The guarantors reacted to these escalating events quickly. Brazil, “reassuming the role of coordinator it had played in 1942 and since” called for an immediate cease-fire and requested that Ecuador and Peru meet immediately with the guarantors (C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999, 410). After an unresolved first round of interactions in Rio, Luigi Einaudi, began his role as an

official third party mediator, representing the U.S. in its continuing guarantor responsibility (Ibid 410).

Brusset's black box of cause and effect, discussed in the introduction, refers to the problem of attribution in intervention evaluations. Entman's Framing Bias, discussed as a method, in a later chapter, details the impact of bias on decision-making. Decision-making in evaluation narratives and decision-making in nation-state conflict are complex processes that consider multiple criteria.

Black box factors in 1994-1995 are too numerous to detail here, yet a few should be mentioned as relevant to the military-political decision-making processes of both conflict actors. Of significance and relevance to the study of impact and the contents of the black box of cause/effect are the "cumulative inflation of two million percent, problems in servicing the external debt, as well as internal unrest fomented by the Maoist guerrilla group, Shining Path" for Peru (Zartman 2005, 248). This significant political-economic data is not frequently discussed in the discourse of hegemonic position in the EPPP archive. Neither Crocker nor Palmer adequately analyze these aspects of the historical context in the frameworks of their respective studies.

The frames of the narratives found in the hegemonic position in the EPPP archive neglect to measure the political cause/effect, in 1992, of Peru's President Alberto Fujimori's direct interference with the congress and suspending portions of the constitution (Hancock and Mitchell 2007, 98). These narratives neglect to highlight nor attempt to measure Peru's political chaotic process of constitutional reform. In response to Peru's domestic turmoil, grass-roots political movements in the northern and southern regions such as the *rondas*

campesinas began to challenge the traditional center of political control (Ibid 91). These factors certainly impacted the decision making in Ecuador-Peru conflict system. In fact, Mares and Palmer assert, “the 1995 war, along with the institutional changes that were taking place in Peru, combined to achieve an important goal for Ecuador; they forced Peru to the negotiating table” (Mares 2012, 127). Neither Mares and Palmer nor Crocker et al. nor Wilkenfield mention or refer by name to the impact of these grass-roots responses to the flaws in the nation-state Peru. Not only do these authors collectively exclude to value the impact of Galtung (Track II) in their attributions, they also collectively exclude to identify the impact of non-institutional, grass-roots collectives (Track III) such as the political power and momentum generated by these *rondas campesinas* in Peru.

The Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) is another impactful source of non-institutionalized political power often excluded in the frames of the hegemonic position in the EPPP archive. This inquiry attempts to redress the asymmetry in the academic attribution literature of the EPPP. In mediating narratives of success in the political outcomes the EPPP, this inquiry highlights that CONAIE originated with the proposition of the bi-national zone component of the Presidential Act of Brasilia. However the impact of this grassroots Indigenous collective is excluded and structured in the decision-making values and frames of those researchers occupying the hegemonic position in the EPPP archive.

Peace of Itamarcy

The section discusses how the Rio Protocol affected the escalation of the peace process in 1995, effectively containing military-political violence to date.

Drawing from Luigi R. Einaudi's personal account of the EPPP, which refers to the declaration of Itamaraty, he writes, "the parties accepted a guarantor offer of a military observer mission and authorized it to monitor an immediate separation of forces and to recommend an area to be demilitarized. Because the guarantors were not prepared to accept an open-ended military commitment, the declaration set a ninety-day limit for the observers, allowing for renewals by common agreement" (C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999, 411).

The Military Observer Mission – Ecuador/Peru (MOMEPE) has been referred to as "the world's most unique and successful peacekeeping operation" (Fishel 1998, 60). Stephen C. Fee writes, "within twelve months after signing the Declaration of Peace (of Itamaraty), Peruvian and Ecuadorian troops in the Upper Cenepa were separated, forces along the border were demobilized, a Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) and a Security Zone (Zone Alfa) were established in formerly conflictive areas, the belligerents themselves were fully integrated into the Peace Force as Observers and maintained a 24 hour multinational presence at border points of greatest tension" (Ibid 60).

The 1995 Peace Declaration of Itamaraty allowed the Guarantors and both Ecuador and Peru to clearly establish and focus on military and political objectives. The Peace Declaration of Itamaraty, as follows, was instrumental to de-escalating the nation-state violence between Ecuador and Peru. Certainly, from a realist perspective, the presence of external nation-state military forces had an impact on the behaviors of the Peru/Ecuador military actors. This instance of externally exerted/applied international-state leveraging/manipulation resulted in the conclusion of the military violence. However, the leveraging/manipulation form of mediation was not singularly operational in the

totality of the EPPP. The peace declaration of Itamaraty, as follows, can be used to demonstrate the utility and impact of leveraged mediation. The weakened political structures of both Ecuador and Peru and the empowered military structures, propping up these weakened political structures, required the external application of nation-state force as an intervention. This inquiry acknowledges that leveraged/manipulative mediation was impactful to the successful outcome of MOMEPE.

“Paragraph 2: Separation of Forces.Immediately and simultaneously separate all the troops of the two nations committed in the conflict with the end of eliminating any risk of reopening hostilities...

Paragraph 3: Establishment of a demilitarized zone. Request that the Observer Mission of the Guarantor Countries [MOMEPE]...recommend to the governments of Ecuador and Peru an area to be totally demilitarized..

Paragraph 5: Demobilization of Forces along the border. Initiate immediately, as a confidence building measure, in the frontier areas not directly committed in the conflict and with the supervision of the Guarantor Countries, a gradual and reciprocal demobilization..

Paragraph 6: Agreement to begin political discussions to demarcate the border. Initiate conversations...to find solutions on the substantive points of disagreement as soon as the previous points are accomplished” (Ibid, 60-61).

Stephen C. Fee (who commanded the US contingent to MOMEPE) writes, “To accomplish paragraphs 2,3, and 5 (technical, military objectives) –the

parties agreed to the deployment of a Peacekeeping Force to the Upper Cenepa: 10 Observers from each of the four guarantor nations and a 90-man administrative/logistical support package from the United States...Paragraph 6, the agreement to begin political discussions to demarcate the border, is a political objective dependant upon the success of the MOMEF in executing the tasks laid out in paragraphs 2,3 and 5” (Ibid 60). In fact, Stephen C. Fee’s narrative contains the only use of the word ‘leveraging’ amongst those narratives surveyed in the EPPP archive originating from actual participants in the EPPP. However, he is not referring to a form of mediation. He writes, “We are left with one final question: Is there enough political will and patience on the part of the Guarantors and the Parties to leverage this MOMEF success while a political solution is hammered out” (Ibid 69).

Conclusion of history & problematizing political exclusive claims

Two PCI impact assessments in the EPPP archive attribute the success of the peace process to leveraging/manipulation in mediation. However, the words leveraging/manipulation are nowhere to be found in these historical narrative accounts, with the exception of Fee, whose discourse as a military commander, circulates realist tropes. The historical accounts of the conflict focus on the diplomatic efforts of the institutionalized actors. This inquiry asks; how can the Wilkenfeld, Young, Quinn and Asal study claim that the manipulation form of mediation impacted the outcome of the EPPP? Also, how can Crocker, Hampson and Aall’s study claim that leveraging was the ticket to success in the EPPP?

Defining leveraging as operating from a base of power and a premise that “mediators need to develop some type of leverage or base of power to become

interesting and helpful to the conflict parties,” the authors list the Ecuador Peru Peace Process as a example of successful leveraging (C. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 2015). A researcher must infer and interpret the application of these forms of mediation in its context. With a definition, “operate from a base of power”, the assessor of leveraging must assess all possible bases of power and decide which ones were operational in this instance. The authors state, “In cases of mediation success, third parties have taken advantage of several of these leverage resources. In the Ecuador-Peru inter-state case of 1995-98, the mediators were the historic guarantors defined in the 1943 Rio Protocol, and they worked together closely, surrounding the conflict parties, coaching and planting ideas, and ultimately found themselves being asked to propose the solution” (Ibid 372). This claim is based on Luigi Einaudi’s narrative of events. Moreover, a detailed and deep historical study reveals many sources and dimensions of power. The historical material reveals more data about the conflict and the actors, and the several complexities in identifying sources where leverage/manipulation functioned and originated from.

Einaudi (Track I mediator) presents the Political Realist narrative of events as an actual third party mediator in the EPPP. He does not use the word leveraging. While referring to his narrative as a source of their claims, Crocker, Hampson and Aall circulate and re-produce the Realist discourse of leveraging. In his detailing of the final settlements, Einaudi mentions “the 54.4 square kilometer of adjacent ecological reserves freely transitable by members of native communities and coordinated by the help of private nonprofit organizations” but he does not identify the source of this crucial idea (Ibid, 425). Johan Galtung (Track II mediator), in his discourse implies that he proposed the idea of a bi-

jason zachidniak 19/12/19 4:13 PM
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

national zone (“Breaking the Cycle of Violent Conflict with Johan Galtung - YouTube” n.d.; Galtung 2002). Sub-altern discourses, such as CONAIE, also claim the bi-national zone as their idea. Yet these ‘other’ forms and channels of mediation are erased in the academic discourse in the EPPP archive. This thesis positions Galtung amongst the sub-altern discourses. The hegemonic discourses (C. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 2015, Palmer 1997 and others) construct their details of the EPPP around Einaudi’s discourse, which excludes any mention of and credit to Galtung. As a result of Galtung’s participation in the EPPP and the discursive exclusion of his participation and impact, this thesis positions his discourse amongst the sub-altern discourse. In the footnotes section of Einaudi’s work, note 28, he gives enormous credit to other institutional elites, Foreign Ministers, Ambassadors, the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, yet he curiously excludes any mention or reference to Johan Galtung’s contributing role as an independent mediator (Ibid, 429). Einaudi’s narrative also excludes mention or reference to grass-roots/Track III channels of mediation operational during the EPPP.

The subaltern narrative:

Galtung and his camp mention their alternative approach to conflict and identify this alternative mode of mediation as bridging in *Searching for Peace; The Road to Transcend*. This approach provides an alternative narrative and an alternative frame on the functions of mediation. Galtung’s approach to mediation primes this inquiry’s interrogation of the impact of the leveraging form claims in the academic literature on the EPPP. The authors suggest that assessment material and institutionalized peacekeeping mechanisms “seems mired in older, self-serving realist constructs. Alternative non-governmental efforts” are

jason zachidniak 19/12/19 4:07 PM
Deleted:

jason zachidniak 19/12/19 4:09 PM
Deleted:

jason zachidniak 19/12/19 4:13 PM
Deleted:

impacted by the “influence and consequences of such constructs”(Galtung 2002, 47).

Galtung cautions against the use of simplistic, narrow scopes in assessments of a peace process suggesting that binary forms of logic exclude other complexities. In Galtung’s frame, leveraging is “imposed, punitive peace”. He claims that a forced mediation “is a prescription for future war” (Ibid, 47). These statements suggest that Galtung advocates for an alternative form of mediation, and an alternative to the typical cause/effect evaluation. This discourse casts doubt on the realist focus and legitimization of an institutional leveraging application in the EPPP. The bridging approach to mediation explores the bias and assumptions in “the Western, neoliberal perspective on conflict and conflict resolution” (Ibid, 52).

Galtung’s method calls for a structural analysis of the weakness that caused the origins of this conflict and violence. In the case of the EPPP political structures in Ecuador and Peru were weak. In the 1995 episode of violence, the militaries of both nation-states attempted to leverage their territorial possession of the land to claims of nation-state sovereignty of that land. The desire for Ecuador and Peru to assert positive sovereignty is reinforced by traditional and classic political and legal institutional norms such as the legal instrument *uti possedetis de jure*. The discourse contained within the hegemonic position of the EPPP archive does not sufficiently consider how the enforcement of this nation-state international legal norm impacted and caused the violence and perpetuated the conflict between Ecuador and Peru. Neither does this discourse freely circulate that non-institutional forms of mediation impacted the outcomes of the EPPP by disassembling nation-state norms.

In addition to flaws in nation-state institutions, Galtung implies that conflict resolution frameworks are flawed. These frameworks' "orientation is towards individuals or, more specifically, towards leaders and those in power. In most cases, and in almost all international mediation, it is a top-down and elitist approach" (Ibid, 53). Galtung writes, "underlying this approach to conflict resolution at the top level is that in order to bring about the resolution of a conflict, it is necessary first to identify the representative leaders and get them to agree" (Ibid, 53). This subaltern discourse suggests that the discursive structures constructed by, C. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall, Einaudi and Touval and Zartman whose focus on Track I individuals/processes in their discursive framing result in misinformed historical claims about the utility of leveraging. The wider scope and frame that Galtung advocates is important and significant to Post Conflict Intervention frameworks and mediation assessments. Galtung suggests that realist frames obscure alternative and impactful forms of mediation:

The all too frequent focus on leaders assumes not only that the appropriate representatives can be identified, but that they will articulate and advocate the interests of those they are meant to represent. A further difficulty often overlooked is the belief that those in leadership positions will be able to guarantee compliance to the agreement and deliver the support of their respective communities" (Ibid 54).

Galtung's narrative and discourse destabilizes the realist position and frame and helps interrogate bias and binary claims and explores assumptions and the banality of the institutional application and desire for power in nation-

state mediation/interventions and political interactions. Mediation often neglects to address; underlying causes and structures, which generate conflict, residual traumas, psychological/physical suffering, and the enemy perceptions generated and enforced by conflict and violence (Ibid 54). With respect to the EPPP, a hypothesis of this inquiry is that a flaw in the nation-state system caused and generated the border dispute. This flaw in the structure of the contemporary nation-state system, the military's emergence to politically enforce the legal norm/code/instrument of *uti possedetis du jure*, contributed to the causes of violence. Those researchers who focus only on Track I diplomatic processes, in the case of the EPPP could be challenged by this hypothesis. Attributions to the military-political complex are normalized as the traditional resolvers/managers of conflict in realist frames.

Galtung criticizes banal realist mediation intervention tools as “a simplistic process of conflict resolution based on elitist structures and *war culture-driven* approaches to conflict.” As a form of mediation method, it often reinforces and legitimizes “the pursuit of power and interests by outside parties and actors” (Ibid, 74). Galtung suggests that approaches to conflict resolution focused only on top-level leaders, without addressing the underlying structures and causes of the conflict, not only fail to create peace, but “often lay the foundations for the outbreak of future wars” (Ibid, 74). Traditional approaches to conflict resolution are “embedded in a state-centered paradigm focusing on leaders and elites rather than structures and causes, reinforcing the processes and dynamics of conflict rather than opening for their transformation” (Ibid, 74). Critical of top-down approaches to peace-building, Galtung suggests that leveraging/manipulation forms of mediation may provoke conflict, “leading to a

reduction in options, locking in the conflict and blocking the room for alternatives generated from a variety of actors” (Ibid, 74).

Peace-building, Galtung believes, includes the consideration of new approaches to conflict and emphasizes “complementary and mutually reinforcing processes’ of both/and rather than either/or solutions” (Ibid, 75). Peace building, according to Galtung, “is not about excluding approaches” (Ibid, 75). Conflict resolution framed as mediation between nation-state leaders, especially in case of the EPPP, “reinforces the hierarchical divide between those identified with the power to take and implement decisions, and those treated as objects or the victims of conflict” (Ibid 75). Galtung’s approach and discourse on mediation impacted the orientation of this inquiry. Bridging mediation functions to reinforce/legitimize multi-track, bottom-up/ grass-roots processes of mediation. Galtung informs the subaltern narrative of mediation in the case of the EPPP.

“What is important to recognize is that it is not only the agreements reached, but the process of mediation itself. Those working for peace (not only as an alternative to violence, but as an end and a process in itself) must remember not to lock themselves in any one particular ‘solution’/approach, or to overextend themselves in one direction to the neglect of others” (Ibid, 78).

Drawing on Galtung’s mediation discourse, this inquiry demonstrates how the texts and discourse in the hegemonic position of the EPPP archive legitimize the conflict resolution frame, by priming the discursive structures in the EPPP assessments with one solution/approach that involves power and force. Examining embedded biases and assumptions in the understanding of conflicts,

Galtung advises a mediator to understand the relevance of any one tool to the transformation or resolution of conflicts writing, “it is necessary to understand how that society views conflict” (Ibid 79). Bridging mediation as a form and approach differs substantially from leveraging. Galtung claims that the bi-national zone with a natural park was his suggestion that he relayed to the ex-President of Ecuador in a meeting in Guatemala City. (Ibid, 179). This alternative approach to understanding mediation destabilizes the framework and claims of Palmer and Crocker, Hampson and All, and discusses the banality of the realist mediation trope, Trouval’s “leveraging is the ticket”.

Monica Herz and Joao Pontes Nogueira also initially focus on institutional discourse and Einaudi’s realist discourse in their book *Ecuador vs. Peru*. They write in the introduction, “Among the guarantors, certain personalities may have had a particularly central role in pushing the process forward and, at some critical junctures, in presenting alternatives that contributed to over-coming significant impasses: the names of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso of Brazil; Ambassador Luigi Einaudi,come to mind” (Ibid 15).

The authors also consider alternative frameworks to the standard legal and institutional ones (political science/international relations). The authors analyze the conflict through a framework of “the dynamics of rivalry” which “involves the redefinition of interests and identities” (Ibid 17). Drawing on Gary Goertz and Paul Diehl’s work, they define rivalry as a “relationship in which both sides deal with issues using the military tools of foreign policy and where militarized conflict between two states repeats itself” (Ibid 16). The authors believe that this framework is particularly helpful for the analysis of the relations between Ecuador and Peru and Ecuador. Herz and Joao Pontes Nogueira write, “While the

immediate and structural causes of the wars of 1941 and 1995 are related to territorial disputes in several sectors of the boarder that can be traced back to the nineteenth century, the difficulties in settling these differences are due to the development of a pattern of rivalry between the two countries” (Ibid, 16).

Drawing on John Vasquez’s work, the authors analyze the conflict with a “combination of objective and subjective elements” (Ibid, 17). They claim, “For Ecuador, not only was the claim to an outlet to the Amazon River Basin a central element of its national identity, the existence of a permanent threat from Peru had substantively defined that country’s international relations for the past five decades” (Ibid 17). The authors suggest that for both countries, “territoriality represented both an objective and subjective interest- it had both a material value and a subjective value related to the essential characteristics of the state” (Ibid 17). Identifying psychological hostility and extreme competition as the pattern of interaction between the states, Herz and Nogueira’s analysis “goes beyond the ‘objective’ consideration of the stakes from a rational, cost-benefit analysis” (Ibid, 17). They write “Examining the attitude of states toward each other in explaining a conflict distances rivalry literature from structural realist perspectives” (Ibid, 17).

In the conclusion of their study, they consider the “possible ending of the Peru-Ecuador rivalry after the Brasilia Accords” (Ibid 17). These authors characterize “the regional security environment” in Latin America at this time in the conflict as a “culture of anarchy” (Ibid, 18). This inquiry draws a parallel between the beliefs embedded in this culture of anarchy and the political realism ideology. The authors believe that such cultures “constrain the actors (Peur/Ecuador) to recognize sovereignty rights” (Ibid, 18). The authors identify

the “legal instrument adopt(ed) to establish the limits of republics, *uti possedetis*” (Ibid 24). An international legal principle translated as, “as you possess, so you will possess”, this political-legal norm caused nation-state violence between Ecuador and Peru to militarily possess territory (Mares 2012, 149n19). The significance of the bi-national zone in the Presidential Act of Brasilia is that this component of the final political outcomes disassembles this international and institutional political norm. Therefore, neither nation is permitted to possess the territory. This change in the international and institutional order of legal norms represents a threat to the ideology of political realists since their ideology is constructed on possessing nation-state territory by force and power.

Correlating negative sovereignty with *uti possedetis de jure*, the authors identify “the legal entitlement to rule a territory without the material and institutional capabilities to exercise that right” (Ibid, 24). They claim, “The principle of *uti possedetis de jure* had...considerable shortcomings given its potential to clash with principles and patterns of nation building associated with the rise of late nineteenth-century nationalism, especially the claim to the right of self-determination” (Ibid, 24). The authors state, “Clearly, *uti possedetis* was useful in many instances of state building in South America, but, as in the case of Peru and Ecuador, several political issues could not be resolved merely by its application” (Ibid, 26). In referring to this concept, I intend to identify it as one of the shortcomings of the nation-state system.

The authors point to the weaknesses of the domestic political institutions, writing, “Resolution of the Peruvian-Ecuadorian border problems during the nineteenth century was made particularly difficult by the weakness of both states” (Ibid, 27). The authors trace the weakness of both states “domestic

conditions” leading up to and during the 1995-1998 EPPP. (Ibid, 71-80). In addressing conflict and attempts at mediation, the authors identify several episodes of mediation/arbitration, and detail the Espinoza-Bonifaz Protocol and the Herrera-Garcia Treaty and the problems associated with both. (Ibid, 29-30). In tracing the 1995-1998 mediation process, they too focus on Track 1 processes and the origin of the bi-national park idea are not attributed to Galtung or Indigenous leadership (CONAIE) in their work (Ibid, 49-81). While their research is very detailed, their conclusions are disappointing. They write, “The attitudes of both parties had to change: each had to cease perceiving the other as a threat. Although more often framed in terms of the shift from competitive (win-lose) situation to a cooperative (problem-solving) perspective in line with a rational-choice paradigm, such a change in attitude has been shown to be a crucial variable in determining the outcome of international negotiations” (Ibid, 86). Although their research is the most balanced perspective to date, they exclude Track II/Track III processes and do not explore discourse outside the International relations paradigm. In their concluding remarks, they write, “When conditions allow, the mediation process should be geared toward conflict resolution, not solely conflict management”. (Ibid, 101). Furthermore, they claim, “the proposition that conflict resolution mechanisms should be regionalized is supported by this research, the knowledge and interest of the international mediators having enhanced the effectiveness of the process (Ibid, 103).

In *Peace versus Justice*, Beth A. Simmons’ article “Forward-Looking Dispute Resolution: Ecuador, Peru, and the Border Issue” details background historical data on the border dispute between Ecuador and Peru. Simmons’ article focuses on the “institutional arrangements”, most notably the final

settlements such as the Presidential Act of Brasilia and the Comprehensive Agreement on Border Integration, Development, and Coexistence, the Trade and Navigation Treaty (Zartman 2005, 252-54). With respect to the bi-national zone, Simmons writes, “ (it) was also an ingenious way of pleasing the indigenous population of this remote region. The settlement plan received significant support from some of the indigenous groups, many of whom had long held that the territory under dispute belonged to neither Ecuador nor Peru” (Ibid, 256).

Simmons does not identify the bi-national zone component of the final settlements of the EPPP as originating from these indigenous groups.

The local indigenous population viewed the border “as a perversity that unnaturally divided people of similar tribes, indigenous leaders generally termed the creation of a park a ‘victory for the people of the Amazon’” (Ibid, 256).

Simmons suggests that the idea of a natural preserve, or a peace park that emphasizes the common ecology of the region as opposed to the division of territory influenced the local indigenous peoples into “a supportive coalition for a lasting settlement” (Ibid, 258). However, the origin of the bi-national park component is not attributed to indigenous leaders or Galtung in this research.

The origin of the bi-national park component of the final settlements can be attributed to Galtung, by his own admission and by the local indigenous population. The Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) on January 31, 1995, called for a cease-fire to the hostilities between Ecuador and Peru. The President of CONAIE, Luis Macas, declared,

“We demand that this opportunity be taken to end this conflict in a peaceful and definitive manner. The Indigenous Peoples located in these zones cannot remain there with this permanent insecurity for

our lives and territories. In order for the border to be secure one must remember that people live there. Placing the resources and territories in the hands of indigenous peoples are (sic) a sufficient guarantee for the peace and integrity of the area. This means a definitive legalization of the territory on the part of the two countries in favor of the Indigenous Peoples. Because of this, the governments' political decisions backed by their armed forces is fatally flawed" ("CONAIE Calls for a Cease Fire" n.d.).

Although the words, peace park or bi-national park are absent from this message, the concept of a "territory on the part of the two countries in favor of the Indigenous Peoples" is inherent in this message.

A news release from the IPS (InterPress Third World News Agency) confirms the origins of the idea of a bi-national park.¹ – "An organization that coordinates Amazon Indigenous communities has proposed today in this capital (Quito) the delimitation of an Indigenous bi-national park in a demilitarized zone as a peaceful alternative to the conflict and war that is escalating between Ecuador and Peru" ("Indigenas Proponen Parque Binacional Fronterizo" n.d.)

Political settlements – Legal Outcomes of the EPPP

The Presidential Act of Brasilia and the Comprehensive Agreement on Border Integration, Development, and Coexistence, the Trade and Navigation Treaty include three significant changes to the international legal norms between Ecuador and Peru. The Brasilia Accords adjusted the sovereignty of the area of Twinitza. The area of Twinitza (located within Peru) was granted to

¹ My own attempt to translate from Spanish to English.

Ecuador. Twinitza is only one square kilometer of heavily mined highland jungle. Another significant change that the Brasilia Accords addressed was the legal protection of Ecuador's rights of navigation to access to the Amazon river. The Track I actors and channels can claim these two outcomes as originating from their diplomatic efforts, yet the Bi-national zone, this inquiry argues, is the most significant outcome. This political-legal outcome disassembled an international-institutionalized legal norm. This disassembling of this legal norm represents a threat to the prestige of the norms advocated and embedded in Political realism. Political realism normalizes the nation-state accumulation of power. In the case of the bi-national zone component of the EPPP, the nation-state forfeits power, territorial claims and the assertion of sovereignty. Examined from Golpen & Plants worldview perspective, the bi-national zone component functions as a "worldview threat" to political realists and hence their tendency to avoid deep historical data collection on this component. Political realist researchers, who have assessed the EPPP, exclude, erase, avoid and silence subaltern data on this most significant component of the political outcomes. Golpen and Plant frame this discursive relational pattern as the subaltern narrative disconfirming the hegemonic narratives' worldview. T&T frame this patterned exclusion as competition for scarce resources, prestige. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of those studies, this inquiry interrogates the EPPP archive for the impact of ideology. The ideology embedded in political realism requires the exertion of power and force, impacting the criteria of assessment frameworks.

In the case of the EPPP, the bi-national zone component of the final settlements represents the deconstruction and disassembly of international and institutional legal norms. The absence of nation-state institutionally exerted

force/power has contributed to the lasting peace and the de-escalation of nation-state violence between Ecuador and Peru. The disassembly/deconstruction of an internationally and institutionally accepted legal norm, *uti possedetis*, represents a worldview threat to analysts who form the In Group of PCI assessment literature on the EPPP. As a result of this threat, they silence and exclude the Out Group (subaltern) and their discourse exhibits structures that compete for prestige, as though it is scarce resource in academic attributions of success and impact assessments of the EPPP.

Chapter Three: Methodological Framework

Introduction

This chapter discusses this investigation's methodological framework, which explores discourse on the EPPP through four forms of analysis. Narrative Mediation and Discourse Analysis explore the hegemonic and subaltern statuses of texts and consider the subject-positions of each text in the literature. These methods are useful to identify the discursive structures and consider the positions that these structures represent. Genealogy, discussed in both Discourse Analysis and in Critical Discourse Analysis, examines functions of discourse. The Genealogical method examines the constitutional qualities of the texts, exploring how different texts are related. The Framing approach explores bias and traces the impact of ideology. Framing bias applied to the EPPP literature helps clarify the impact of ideology in the decision-making of researchers.

These methods all hold discourse as central to their investigations. They are useful to this study because they expose relational patterns in the discourse on the EPPP. This inquiry examines both the structures and the functions of discourse in the academic literature on the EPPP. Each method reveals data,

which is then re-evaluated and collocated with the application of a subsequent method. This study interrogates the EPPP literature for socially constructed patterns of exclusion, avoidance and silencing. These relational patterns exhibited an analyzed in the EPPP discourse resemble not only behavioral/cognitive patterns examined in Social Psychology but also behavioral/cognitive processes examined in the Humanities.

Narrative Mediation

The EPPP literature is initially examined under a framework of Narrative Mediation. John Winslade and Gerald Monk explain that narrative mediation “starts from the idea that people construct conflict from narrative descriptions of events”(Winslade 2001, xi). Narrative Mediation analyzes the narrative qualities of actors in conflict and examines these narratives simultaneously for how they operate and how they relate. Applied to the EPPP, this method considers the EPPP literature, especially the literature of assessment and attribution, as a narrative description. Certain texts and discourses attain privileged status, dominating and subjugating other texts and discourses. A mediator considers this method in the process of mediating two human subjects’ whose narratives/discourses offer conflicting stories about the same event. This inquiry applies this method in the process of mediating two differing narratives about

the outcome of the EPPP. While Narrative Mediation is typically used as a mediation technique, this inquiry employs Narrative Mediation as an interpretive tool. Although this is an unusual choice, the use of a mediation method as opposed to the use of method made for the interpretation of texts, this inquiry employs Narrative Mediation as a method for attempting to mediate the outstanding conflict in the assessment material of the EPPP. Having discovered

the prevalence of biased assessment material on the EPPP, this thesis attempts to perform an experiment; redressing the asymmetry of attribution in the EPPP assessment discourse.

The authors write, “descriptions of problems are typically told in narrative terms. Such problem narratives have often been rehearsed and elaborated over and over again by participants in a conflict....the story operates to create reality rather than on whether it reports accurately on that reality” (Ibid, 3). In addressing discourse, the authors claim,

“The concept of discourse is a useful metaphor in the understanding of mediation. Discourse is both the process of talk and interaction between people, and the products of that interaction. These discourses also give meaning, in the end, to social practices, personal experience, structural arrangements, and institutions. Discourses include the taken-for-granted assumptions that allow us to ‘know how to go on’ (according to Wittgenstein) in social situations of all kinds” (Ibid, 42).

Narrative mediation approaches conflict with a poststructuralist analysis of power. As such, Narrative mediation examines how discursive structures function. This inquiry will examine the EPPP discursive structures and consider how these discourses function. The authors claim that in conflict situations, some discourses have privilege while other discourse do not. They claim, “Discourses offer people positions of greater or lesser entitlement. Within particular discourses, some positions are rendered more legitimate or more visible and others are subjugated. Some voices get heard and others are silenced” (Ibid 51). Narrative Mediation examines discourse for its positioning, identifying

these positions as hegemonic and subaltern (Ibid 58). Due to the conflict exhibited between the hegemonic and subaltern discourse, there is an overlap of the conflicted narratives.

The authors write, "Narrative mediation seeks to capitalize on...overlaps. The mediator strives to bring forth overlapping descriptions of the dispute (rather than settling on a singular, coherent account) in order to create space for new meanings to emerge" (Ibid, 46). The differing attributions between leveraging and bridging represent the overlaps that this study intends to examine. The authors advocate this approach because:

"in a mediation there are likely to be a series of stories at work at different levels. There will be the conflicting stories of the dispute that each party brings...These background stories may include larger stories of relationship...cultural stories...The task of mediation can be considered to be a teasing out of these stories in order to open up possibilities for alternative stories to gain an audience. Rather than searching for the one true story, the narrative mode of thinking welcomes the complexity of competing stories" (Ibid, 53).

This form of mediation identifies dominant and alternative discourses (Ibid 58-61); "Discourses, from a social constructionist perspective, have very real consequences...this idea suggest(s)..that we should pay more attention in mediation to the meanings that are created within such discourses" (Ibid, 125).

The Narrative Mediation process has three phases – "engagement, deconstructing the conflict-saturated story, and constructing the alternative story" (Winslade 2001, 58). This inquiry attempts to follow these three phases.

This study employs Narrative Mediation as an initial method in delineating the distinctions between the hegemonic narrative and the subaltern narrative.

Winslade and Monk encourage the mediator to consider the impacts and generative capabilities of the hegemonic discourse while examining more closely the subaltern discourse. This inquiry employs this method to deconstruct the EPPP data into two conflicting narratives, identifying one narrative as hegemonic and the other as subaltern. Narrative Mediation examines the layers of the conflict story and how these discursive layers relate. In this respect Narrative Mediation is helpful not only for deconstructing the dominance of the hegemonic narrative but also re-constructing the subaltern narrative.

Discourse Analysis

Similar to Narrative Mediation, Discourse Analysis examines layers in the discourse through considering subject-positions. Yet Discourse Analysis examines these layers by taking an inventory of the representations of these positions within the discourse. Discourse Analysis explores the layers and the positions in the arrangement of the discourse. Both methods, Narrative Mediation and Discourse Analysis, examine hierarchical arrangements of discourse. Discourse Analysis also approaches discourse as socially constructed and as a result generative of “links between knowledge production and power” (Dunn and Neumann 2016, 3). Discourse Analysts interrogate language for its capacity to generate systems of meaning and examine texts with attention to ruptures and silences in the discourse (Ibid, 4). This inquiry traces patterns of discursive exclusion identified as “ruptures and silences” in Discourse Analysis. Drawing on Dunn and Neumann’s (2016) manual, this method interrogates the discourse for subject positions. This method also inventories representations

and maps and layers the discourses contained within the academic literature on the EPPP.

Subject Positioning, Dunn and Neumann write, involves the interpretation of the ways in which texts “work to create a knowable reality by linking subjects and objects to one another in particular ways” (Dunn and Neumann 2016, 112). The authors suggest, “relationships are established through the construction of a subject positioning based on opposition or similarity” (Ibid, 112). This inquiry considers both the similarities between the positions of the authors of the EPPP texts amongst the hegemonic position and the opposition between the hegemonic and the subaltern positions. The similarities among the hegemonic position, aside from the advancing of leveraging/manipulation mediation as the impactful factor, have a tendency to focus exclusively on Track I processes at the exclusion of other track processes. These texts as a result of the subject positioning application began to represent positions, which their authors occupied.

Dunn and Neumann urge the analyst to examine subject positions, writing,

“Taken together, these textual mechanisms involved in subject positioning endow various kinds of subjects with particular attributes and place them in relation with other subjects and objects.

Analytically, it is important to recognize that these representations are not neutral or innocuous signifiers, but enable actors to ‘know’ the object and to act upon what they ‘know” (Ibid, 113).

Further, the authors urge the analysis of what these positions mean claiming, “Representations have very real political implications because certain paths of

action become possible within distinct discourses, while other paths of action become unthinkable” (Ibid, 113). Applied to the EPPP literature, the path of action/policy that the subject position represents is the advocacy of external force in mediation. Dunn and Neumann write, “These representations enable and justify certain actions” (Ibid, 113). With respect to students of mediation and Conflict Studies, these texts justify the use of leveraging/manipulation in mediation. Dunn and Neumann write, “Thus discursive practices create a truth-effect” (Ibid, 113). The authors suggest that within these constructions is a “discursively produced policy that authorizes” certain actions, the quest for external force or leveraging in the case of the EPPP (Ibid, 113).

The Discourse Analysis method also helps identify what these discourses represent. Dunn and Neumann discuss the process of Inventorying Representations. They claim, “ A discourse usually contains a dominating representation of reality and one or more alternative representations. Discourse analysis therefore is particularly well suited for studying situations where power is maintained by aid of culture and challenged only to a limited degree, that is what Gramscians call hegemony” (Ibid, 117). The resemblances in methodology between Narrative Mediation and Discourse Analysis are clear. Moreover, Dunn and Neumann write, “Methodologically, the task is to search out and identify these various representations and possible asymmetries between them” (Ibid, 117).

In proposing the term “monument” and defining it as a “discursive construction” the authors claim, “monuments frequently position themselves in the discourse by referring (adversarially or sympathetically) to texts that were previously considered monuments” (Ibid, 117). In the case of the EPPP

literature, this inquiry focuses on sympathetic references in the discourse about the EPPP. This paper argues that discourse originating from Luigi Euiaudi, operates as 'monumental' in status in the EPPP literature. Not only do Crocker et al. rely on his narrative for their claims on the effect of leveraging, but also Palmer and Mares rely heavily on his narrative. The authors state, "Inventorying these representations over time helps contribute to a 'map' of the discourses being analyzed" (Ibid, 117).

With respect to Mapping Discourse, Dunn and Neumann state,

"Ultimately, a discourse analyst should conduct an investigation of which representations are articulated by a particular discourse or text, how they are linked to achieve discursive stability, where instabilities and slips between these constructions occur, and how competing discourses construct the same representations to different effects. This can be achieved by mapping the discourses under investigation. If inventorying representations is about identifying locations, mapping is about recognizing relations in the constitution of a discourse" (Ibid, 118).

In the process of mapping a discourse, the authors suggest that "researchers must examine the degree to which representations continue, change or challenge existing discourses" (Ibid, 118). Applied to the EPPP literature, this inquiry focuses on the degree to which representations continue. The various EPPP literature 'continues' to focus on Track I processes and in doing so, the discourse examines only political and institutional actors while excluding the contribution of other actors. The authors write, "If there is only

one representation [Track I in the case of the EPPP] the discourse is closed” (Ibid, 118).

In mapping a discourse, the discourse analyst identifies positions. Normally, one position dominates the discourse.(Ibid, 118-119). Applied to mediation studies, the dominant position in the literature is that “leveraging is the ticket”. This inquiry (in the final chapter) traces this phrase as a realist trope in mediation cases and interrogates the utility of finding external force (threats and rewards) to induce the conflict actors to comply with the mediated process. The authors suggest, “In mapping discourses, one should show the affinities and differences between representations in order to demonstrate whether they belong to the same discourse” (Ibid, 119). Applied to the EPPP literature, the affinities amongst the hegemonic representations are they all contain references to and exclusively trace political and institutional actors’ advocacy and application of the use of force (leveraging/manipulation) over the conflict actors.

Dunn and Neumann refer to these affinities as a “trope” which is “employed within the discourse” (Ibid, 119). This inquiry examines the usage of this trope within the EPPP literature, which describes and advocates the application of force upon conflict actors by a third party. Dunn and Neumann write, “In principle, the discourse will carry with it the ‘memory’ of its own genesis. Showing how each text is made possible by the preceding texts, often it is possible to find a prehistory to the main representation” (Ibid, 120). In the final chapter of this inquiry, the history of leveraging as an often prescribed mediation strategy for successful outcomes to international conflicts is examined. In the case of the EPPP, the trope, “leveraging is the ticket” is repeated exactly as it originally appeared in early conflict resolution

frameworks. In the case of leveraging in mediation studies, the discourse does carry with it the “memory of its own genesis”. The phrase, as it was originally prescribed by Touval, is repeated verbatim by Crocker.

Dunn and Neumann relate, “meaning and materiality must be studied together” while posing a crucial question for the analyst; what is the scope or degree of social construction in the relationship between ‘fact’ and ‘representation’ (Ibid, 122). In their reference to Foucault’s work about archaeology and genealogy, they claim, “the key in archaeology as in social analysis, is to specify what changes and what does not, and how. The same is true of genealogy” (Ibid, 123). With respect to mediation and the EPPP literature, the trope of leveraging does not change. Leveraging is the ticket is a phrase that has become structured in mediation and post-conflict intervention assessment materials. This trope impacts the discourse on mediation and assessment materials, narrowing the scope of attribution to institutional actors and processes.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis supplemented with a Genealogical approach interrogates the intertextuality of separate discourses and examines how the discourse itself is contingent on power and knowledge production relations. This study applies Critical Discourse Analysis as a methodology in analyzing power in the production and circulation of these discourses. Seantel Anais discusses the possibility of unifying genealogical and critical discourse analytic approaches in qualitative textual research. Both approaches question how “knowledges are shaped by discourse” (Anais 2013, 124). She explores how

Critical Discourse Analysis and genealogy “share a critical post-structuralist approach to the analysis of texts”(Ibid, 124). While discussing genealogy, she asserts that it is a methodological process “concerned with telling the story of how a set of discursive and non-discursive practices come into being and interact to form a set of political, economic, moral, cultural and social institutions which define the limits of acceptable speaking, knowing, and acting” (Ibid, 125). Anais says of the Genealogist that they “undertake historical investigations of the emergence of certain epistemological structures and their associated discourses, as well as how knowledge, power, and claims to truth interact both to form cascades of practice and to reinforce the discourses that they emanate from” (Ibid, 125). Relating this to the literature of the EPPP, the discourses highlighting the impact of institutional actors practice of leveraging, and the phrase “leveraging is the ticket” reverberate through the literature.

In paraphrasing Foucault, Anais claims, “Genealogy is concerned with a more modest inquiry into the emergence of objects of knowledge and intervention and the ‘regimes of truth’ that grow up around them” (Ibid, 125). Furthermore, she clarifies the objective of genealogy in writing that it “ does not seek answers to the question of ‘why’, nor does it trace a practice from beginning to middle to end. Rather, genealogy asks ‘how’ and through what relays of power?” (Ibid,127).

Anais states that genealogists “take issue with practices that appear to others to be given and necessary; they can generate research questions by approaching mundane practices with suspicion or uncertainty; in using their research to expose widely accepted institutional practices, they can reveal seemingly ‘natural’ power relations to be contrived” (Ibid, 127).

In defining discourse, Anais claims, “within CDA scholarship, there is no unified consensus on what discourse should be taken to mean, nor is there complete agreement on how it relates to historical ‘text’. Despite these challenges, genealogy and CDA bear a strong connection in that they both see discourse not merely as a reflection of social life, but as *constructing* the contours of it” (Ibid, 128). Examining the prescription of leveraging and the attribution of success due to leveraging in mediation is important for a critical analysis. Further to the connections between genealogy and CDA, Anais writes that they both,

“converge on an important point, which provides sufficient justification for a working relationship between them: discourse is taken to mean both a set of speech acts – whether written or spoken – and a framework for ordering language in a systematic fashion. However, while both methodological approaches regard language as an object of inquiry, genealogists maintain a different kind of relationship to language: they study ‘the fundamental words, phrases and propositions not on the basis of structure or the author-subject from whom they emanate but on the basis of the simple function that they carry out in a general situation’ (Deleuze, 1988, p. 17).

The realist’s claim that institutionalized power successfully intervened in the Ecuador and Peru conflict by employing leveraged mediation. The fundamental phrase, leveraging, functions as a policy prescription for future international mediators to search for and accumulate external power and force. This policy prescription, exerting external power and forcing the conflict actors to behave in a certain way,

was not the sole form of mediation in the EPPP and claims that suggest leveraging was the sole impactful form of mediation require debate.

Both genealogy and CDA focus “not on the ultimate ‘truth’ of an account, but on the symbolic meanings associated with oft-repeated words and phrases, and the recurrent ‘frames, narratives, and cultural scripts’ ” (Ibid, 128).

Examining the assessment material of the EPPP, this inquiry focuses on the symbolic meaning of the frequently repeated word, leverage and the recurrent institutional framing that suggests that these actors/channels can claim success of the EPPP outcomes.

Instead of determining causes in mediation assessments Anais suggests that the genealogist “embraces contingency” as opposed to “imposing a form of order or logic on the past”. This allows researchers to identify the fabrication of those things which had previously been understood as given” (Ibid, 129).

In placing genealogy and CDA in conversation, Anais highlights “three practical conventions associated with CDA: assembling an archive, attending to the systematic nature of text, and reading for silence” (Ibid, 130). With respect to the archive, Anais relates, “ the genealogist studies the relational aspect of discourse, that is, its tendency to articulate with other discursive formations” (Ibid, 130). Applied to the EPPP literature, this method interrogates each text’s sources and references, while examining the hegemonic discourse’s positionality and frequency to refer to the subaltern discourse’s position.

Within the archive, the genealogist traces “the problematization of a given practice [leveraging] or subjectivity [worldview/ideology] through a process of descent and emergence” (Ibid, 130). Similar to the identification of a

monumental text in DA, and the subsequent tracing of the monument's influence, CDA traces emergent and descendant phenomena:

“descent refers to separate events that come together in contingent ways in order to make up a particular practice and to trace different or separate lines of event in terms of how they function in unrelated spheres, it recognizes ‘that unity derives from a dispersion of singular events’. The concept of emergence is integral to an appreciation of descent, in that it distinguishes between the movements of history as progressive and instead allows us to conceive of it as the play of force relations all engaged in a fluid struggle” (Ibid, 130)

With respect to ‘attending to the systematic nature of text’, Anais writes that this process involves “taking a critical approach to its performance and material aspects and, uncovering the power relations inherent in its production and circulation” (Ibid, 131). She declares, “CDA can be considerably strengthened by the genealogical habit of attending to the production and legitimation of textual materials. This involves uncovering the conditions of possibility behind documents specifically, and forms of discourse more generally by attending to their structure. The regulation of textual production and legitimation operate in a double sense, where the format of an institutional text is determined by the conventions of the institution, and adherence to institutional conventions underwrites the legitimacy both of the document and the institution that disseminates it.” (Ibid, 131)

In the interrogation of the origin of these EPPP texts, this investigation questions if the links are institutional conventions or discipline representations.

Anais claims, "Institutional texts systematize more than just the presentation of information; they adhere to strict rules concerning what can be said and in what ways. I would add that the physicality of texts reconfigure the researcher's findings of the conceptual and political contents that they inhere" (Ibid, 131). In terms of physicality, these EPPP texts that advocate a realist perspective have the widest range of circulation and the academic researcher has easy access to the these text. Further she adds, "texts should be analysed in terms of the institutional labour that they perform. Researchers who attend to the systematic nature of texts ask the question, What does this text do? Institutional texts systematize more that just the presentation of information; they adhere to strict rules concerning what can be said and in what ways" (Ibid, 131). The inquiry examines the hegemonic position's adherence to leveraging.

Framing Bias

Entman's inquiry tracing Bias in media is also helpful to this inquiry's tracing of Bias and the impact of ideology in the EPPP assessment/PCI literature. The analysis of bias integrates research on framing, priming and agenda-setting.

[This thesis does not integrate research on dissemination nor does it consider measuring the audience of those reading EPPP assessment texts.](#) Entman

suggests that bias is the organizing concept of this "systemic effort to conceptualize and understand political power" (Entman 2007, 163). Entman identifies two meanings inherent in the definitions of Bias. Framing bias examines content bias – "news that favors one side rather than providing equivalent treatment to both sides in a political conflict" (Ibid, 163). Examining bias also requires examining Decision-making bias, which considers "motivations and mindsets of journalists who allegedly produce the biased

content” (163). Motivations and mindsets are both examined in In-Group Identity/ and worldview studies, which this study uses as a reference for relational patterns. Although my inquiry does not examine the news or the media, it treats the academic literature in a similar way. While Entman examines how media communicates, my inquiry examines how the EPPP assessment/PCI literature communicates.

Entman examines the media for its “role in distributing power” (Ibid, 165). He claims that an analysis of framing will clarify the examination of bias. He defines framing as, “the process of culling a few elements of perceived reality and assembling a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation” (Ibid, 164). Developed frames perform four functions: “problem definition, causal analysis, moral judgment, and remedy promotion” (Ibid, 164). Framing functions to “shape and alter audience members’ interpretations and preferences through priming” (Ibid, 164). He suggests, “Frames introduce or raise the salience or apparent importance of certain ideas, activating schemas that encourage target audiences to think, feel, and decide in a particular way” (Ibid, 164). The audience from Entman’s inquiry becomes academics, students, researchers and post-conflict intervention assessors for this inquiry.

Entman urges that an analysis of power must consider agenda setting, claiming that Agenda setting is “another name for successfully performing the first function of framing: defining problems worthy of public...attention” (Ibid, 164). This inquiry is especially concerned with assessment material of the EPPP and Entman’s framing bias method is particularly helpful for examining assessments. He writes, “ The second or ‘attribute’ level of agenda setting

centrally involves claims that happened to encompass the core business of strategic framing: to highlight the causes of problems, to encourage moral judgments... and to promote favored policies” (Ibid, 165). Interrogating the agenda-setting function of the discourse, Entman names this “ Priming”, and identifies priming as the goal, “the intended effect, of strategic actors’ framing activities” (Ibid, 165). In effect, this paper interrogates the intended effect of the realists’ framing of the EPPP and suggests that realists prime their audience for the accumulation of power as a successful mediation remedy.

Entman suggests that political power is exercised by elites applying agenda setting, framing and priming as tools. In connecting these tools to the study of bias, Entman suggests distinguishing bias from news slant. Defining Slant, Entman writes “Slant characterizes individual news reports and editorials in which the framing favors one side over the other in a current or potential dispute” (Ibid, 165). Entman urges scholars “ to assess the larger theoretical implications in these demonstrated instances of consistent one-sided framing” (Ibid, 165). If the slant is patterned and persists across “time, message dimensions, and media outlets, it means that the media may be systematically assisting certain entities to induce their preferred behavior in others....the media may be helping to distribute political power to particular groups, causes or individuals” (Ibid, 165).

Entman proposes a definition and an advantage of the examination of content bias. Content bias is the analysis of “consistent patterns in the framing of mediated communication that promote the influence of one side in conflicts over the use of government power” (Ibid, 165). In revealing media content biases, the analyst demonstrates “patterns of slant that regularly prime audiences,

consciously or unconsciously, to support the interests of particular holders or seekers of political power”(Ibid, 165). An advantage to examining bias and slant in this way is “it avoids irresolvable questions about truth and reality....As political communication research demonstrates, indisputable facts only play a partial role in shaping the framing words and images that flow into an audience’s consciousness” (Ibid, 166). Entman claims, “almost any nontrivial reality will be controversial – susceptible to two or more framings” (Ibid, 166). He suggests that this form of analysis “should study how the news slants in particular instances and whether slant falls into recurrent patterns that ‘mobilize bias’ in the political system by helping some actors regularly prevail over others” (Ibid, 166). This inquiry in lieu of studying the news, examines the EPPP assessment/PCI literature for recurrent patterns of slant.

Entman claims decision-making bias is inevitable, “ it seems pointless either to deny or to denounce the existence of these decision-making biases. All information-processing persons and organizations employ what might more neutrally be called heuristics”(Ibid, 166). Individual journalists and journalistic institutions follow “rules and norms that guide their processing of information and influence the framing of media texts” (Ibid, 166). This inquiry examines the academics and the academic institutional discourse on the EPPP for the norms that guide their data processing and the influence/impact of their framing of EPPP texts.

Entman proposes a formula in which the role of ideology plays a significant role “in the complex interactions of decision biases..(which) give rise to news slant” (Ibid,166). This method of inquiry analyzes the academic literature as Entman analyzes the news. Entman’s formula accounts for

ideological interference. He states, "The formula asserts that the degree to which a single news construction favors one ideology, interest, group, issue stand, or individual against opponents is a function of the perceived facts plus the interactions of each side's skill at new management with journalistic decision biases" (Ibid, 167). Entman claims the equation suggests that, "any given set of perceived facts can yield news that slants toward one side, the other side, or even (as in the journalistic ideal) neither side. Because facts rarely speak for themselves, strategic actors must deploy such assets as charisma, a delicate balance of intimidation and flattery, and rhetorical proficiency to promote favored framing" (Ibid, 167).

This method examines "the evaluative standards they (journalists) apply to actors playing the political game" (Ibid, 167). My inquiry examines the evaluative standards academics apply to political actors' interventions in mediation. Evaluating the evaluative standards demonstrates news slanted "favorably toward the side regarded as most powerful, popular and unified"(Ibid, 167). Evaluating the production norms in a context of market competition demonstrates "qualities of news as simplification and fragmentation"(Ibid, 167). This inquiry examines both fragmentation and simplification, through exclusion of data. Entman states that, "Ideologies held by reporters and editors may also play a role in shaping the news" (Ibid, 167). He writes, "Personal ideology combines with all the other forces in the model...responding to market incentives"(Ibid, 167). Entman suggests, "If the decision biases persistently converge with stable concentrations of political skill and resources possessed by particular interests, media frames could consistently favor certain policy outcomes and political actors"(Ibid, 167).

He claims that objectivity is difficult to achieve in writing, as “such content biases could exist even where journalists and news organizations possess no conscious ideological goals, indeed where they consciously pursue balance” (Ibid, 167). Entman suggests that accurate measurements are a limitation of his project. He writes,

“Although political psychology and opinion scholarship does not exactly offer a cornucopia of established generalizations of which bias researchers might build definitive measurements, it does provide plenty of guidance. The caveat is merely that we incorporate knowledge about agenda setting, framing, and priming into bias analysis and not that such analysis must await final conclusions from political behavioral research” (Ibid, 169).

In conclusion, Entman advances that the Framing bias method is not exact and “requires more conceptual refinement and empirical research before reaching any final conclusions” (Ibid, 170). However, he believes that this method clarifies the correlation between clear cases of news slant and the “officials favored by the slant” achieving “more power and free[dom] to do what they want without the anticipation that voters might punish them. And those who lose the framing contest become weaker, less free to do (or say) what they want” (Ibid, 170).

Entman suggests two benefits from “integrating framing, agenda setting and priming research by applying the concept of media bias to illuminate political power” (Ibid, 171). One benefit is the wide range and “convergence of evidence about patterns in the media’s problem definitions, causal analyses, moral judgments and preferred policies....Another advantage of framing research

is that it could also improve normative prescriptions for enhancing the media's contributions to democracy" (Ibid, 171) . While this inquiry does not consider the media's representations of the EPPP, it does focus on the academic literature on the EPPP in the same manner, with the expectation to improve the 'normative prescriptions' for improving the academic literature's assessments of mediation in the EPPP.

This chapter has introduced and discussed the four methods of analysis that the EPPP academic assessment/PCI literature will be examined with in the subsequent chapter. All four methods of analysis hold discourse as central to their frameworks of inquiry. Narrative Mediation and Discourse Analysis are helpful for examining the emergent layers in the archive of the EPPP data, clarifying the subject positioning of the various texts and allowing this study to label the texts as belonging to either a hegemonic or a subaltern status. Genealogy and Critical Discourse Analysis are helpful for examining how the texts in the archive function. Finally, this inquiry relies on the Framing Bias method in tracing the negative impacts of both ideology and bias in the assessment/PCI academic literature on the EPPP. Each method is applied individually to the EPPP archive in the next chapter.

Data and Analysis: Chapter 4

Introduction

This chapter examines the academic literature through the frames and methods discussed in the previous chapter. This chapter examines the academic discourse on the EPPP for its narrative qualities and in doing so, attempts to redress asymmetries in attribution. Furthermore, this chapter examines the positions of the academic discourse on the EPPP and finds the monumental

impact of one mediator's narrative on the assessment materials. Applying Genealogy and CDA, this chapter later examines how much of the academic discourse refers to a limited historical dataset. Finally, applying the Framing Bias method, this chapter analyzes the limited historical dataset and how it is mobilized by Political Realists in their assessments of the EPPP functions.

Narrative Mediation

Narrative Mediation (NM) applied to the archive of texts on the EPPP is advantageous to explore the subaltern narrative of the PCI impact assessment and attribution of success story. Applying NM to the EPPP archive clarified a pattern in conflicts, which is to have one dominant/legitimized story and a marginalized/illegitimate story. NM is useful in the EPPP archive for exploring the assessment/attribution discursive dispute.

NM explores how conflict is constructed and perpetuated in discourse and the method encourages a mediator in a conflict to deconstruct the subjective positions exhibited by the disputing parties. By deconstructing subjective positions, disputants generate of a new narrative of the conflict. The revised narrative permits the disputants to have a more evolutionary understanding of their positions. This reexamination of their respective previously fixed discursive positions helps them to emerge from their conflict.

This method considers each disputant's story and description of events. In practicing this method, the mediator engages with descriptive qualities that the conflict actor presents and simultaneously, the descriptive qualities that the actor does not present as their narrative of the story. A mediator balances the evidence, which conflict actors employ in their narratives as the drivers of conflict. Likewise, this inquiry attempts to balance the evidence, which

academics employ in their narratives as the drivers of conflict intervention. The mediator analyzes several dimensions of each description: why is the conflict actor saying this, how is it said, in what order are the events, how do the conflict actors emotional response impact their telling of the story. Other factors also impact the narrative. The narrative mediator analyzes the conflict actors communication for clues that the conflict actor believes his/her narrative is totally objective. The mediator considers the symmetries and asymmetries in the descriptive qualities of the discourse.

In doing so, the mediator analyzes each conflict actor's description of events as subjective. This assessment framework for analysis allows for ambiguity and this framework considers an unstable discourse as the norm. The mediator attempts to stabilize and redress asymmetric discursive qualities of the conflict as the conflict actors narrate details of the conflict.

The mediator examines the discourse and observes and detects agendas, privileged status, domination, marginalization, subjection, exclusion of the other. The mediator examines the discourse for bias, prejudice and assumptions in the positionality of the conflict actor's discourse. These instances of exclusion, silencing, and avoidance are significant. The mediator examines discourse as a behavior and for traces of cognitive processes.

A Narrative Mediator analyzes discourse for its structural qualities of oppression and domination. His/Her focus of analysis is how these structures function in the discourse to perpetuate the status of the dominated and oppressed. In redressing how these structures function, the mediator mediates the narrative. The mediator examines how the respective conflict actors present

their stories and how these stories relate. There is neither objectivity nor conclusion in the process of mediation and the transforming of the discourse.

While Narrative Mediation normatively assumes two actors in conflict, this inquiry of the EPPP archive of academic literature assumes two diverging assessment narratives and a difference in evaluations of the impact/effects of two forms of mediation: leveraging and bridging. Each form of mediation has an inherent assumption of the causes/origins of the conflict and how a mediator may attempt to address transforming the conflict. Since these two differing forms were operational during the mediation of the EPPP, this inquiry interrogated the discursive qualities of the academic literature for reasons to explain these differences in the assessments of cause of conflict and the effect of mediation. Several authors in the archive attempted to qualify the impactful form of mediation in one word. Manipulation was used in one study, while the borrowing of leverage was used in another study. Both these formulations of mediation contain, in their definitions a reference to power and force exerted upon conflict actors.

My inquiry interrogated these assessment attempts and traced a tendency to identify the effects of power/force exerted by a third party mediator. My inquiry questions, how can power be measured? Certainly, since the EPPP was a multi-party and multi-mediator effort, the measurements of power exerted are difficult to identify and require multiple assessments. This is complicated, especially due to the confidential code of mediation. This inquiry considered the divergences in the EPPP archive as exhibiting a conflictual relationship in the discourse and examined the archive for hegemonic qualities.

This inquiry suggests that mediation cannot and should not be qualified with the use of one word. Studies that claim that manipulative/leveraged mediation were impactful do not examine all dimensions and forms of mediation. This paper argues that mediation studies and mediation assessments could be enhanced with attention to more inclusive frames. My inquiry exposes the complexities in attempts to attribute the success or outcome of a Peace Process in which multi-party mediators and multi-tracks are operational. There are several complexities in analyzing the effect of a form of mediation. Brusset's black box and attribution problem (addressed in the introduction) speak to this complexity.

The differences in the forms of mediation are important. From the articulating emphasis on the forms of mediation that were assessed as impactful and effecting the outcome, one form, Power/Force relations emerged as hegemonic in the academic literature. The quantity of texts referring to the institutionalized exertion of power, using Track I actor and channels significantly outnumbered the other texts, and these other texts emerged as subaltern. All the significant academic works detailing the EPPP (Herz and Nogueira 2002; C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999b, Mares 2012) exclusively highlight and trace the institutional interventions in the EPPP. Only one significant academic work traces Galtung's contribution and that work, contained within the academic literature, is Galtung's own narrative (Galtung, 2002). The data concerning the contributions from grassroots Indigenous collectives is not even contained with the academic literature. This data was sourced from the internet, not an academic source, yet still relevant in this case. Since a hierarchy was emerging in the examination and analysis of the EPPP archive, the inquiry considered

another method for examining the layers. This need for an alternative method was satisfied with the use of Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis, which will be addressed later in this chapter.

NM examines how discourses operate in conflict. NM analyzes how these discourses function to generate reality as opposed to if these discourses “report accurately on that reality”(Winslade 2001, 3). So, if the hegemonic discourse contained references to power and forceful relations, and how these relations impacted the EPPP, their assessments of force function to generate this application in future mediations. The hegemonic position, in attributing force/power relations as the generational factor contributing the successful outcome of the Peace Process, has to be interrogated and questioned in redressing this asymmetry. The subaltern position requires further exploration. The hegemonic position focuses on Track 1 and institutional actors, so the inquiry also attempts to identify and trace the impact of other actors/processes Track II/ III/ grassroots.

Winslade claims NM examines discourse for its productive qualities. He writes, “The concept of discourse is a useful metaphor in the understanding of mediation. Discourse is both the process of talk and interaction between people, and the products of that interaction” (Ibid, 42).

NM analyzes discourses for meaning (Ibid, 42). The meaning that is generated by discourse impacts “social practices, personal experience, structural arrangements and institutions”(Ibid, 42). Applying this method to the examination EPPP archive means that the hegemonic attributions of Leveraging/Manipulation to the successful outcome of the EPPP require further analysis with further consideration to their social and structural contexts.

Moreover, NM encourages the mediator to investigate the discourse for taken-for granted assumptions. In applying this step of the method to the EPPP archive, I grouped the scholars whose discourse included Leveraging/ Manipulation as impactful to the EPPP and interrogated their academic disciplines. Although the hegemonic grouping was variable, the disciplines of Political Science/International Relations formed a complex and were prominent. My inquiry investigated these disciplines for a common/shared taken-for-granted assumption. The Political Realism ideology contained many assumptions about conflict that resembled the hegemonic position's examination of power relations in the literature. As a result of this theoretical and ideological orientation, this inquiry assumes that realists narrowly focus their analytical lens on the application of institutional power and only examine how this power affects relations. This paper argues that this narrow focus, on institutionalized power impacts their assessment capacities. This paper suggests that realist worldviews and ideological orientations inform their cognitive capacities, creating biased decision making in their analytical frameworks. This paper demonstrates that the focus/theoretical/ideological orientation on power impacts the criteria and frameworks in their Post-Conflict Intervention assessments.

In re-examining the EPPP archive from a narrative mediation perspective, my inquiry found several researchers discussing the impact of Track I institutional actors applying (manipulative forms of mediation) leveraging or the borrowing of leverage in their singular examination of a top-down mediation form. (Herz and Nogueira 2002; C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999b; Palmer 1997b; Mares 2012b; Fishel 1998b; C. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 2015b;

Bercovitch and Gartner 2009). The scope of these assessments is narrow, as they exclusively focus on and attribute institutional leveraging as the key to the successful outcome of mediation. This discourse grouping functioned to confirm and verify its own assumptions and in doing so, the discourse functioned to perpetuate its exclusive focus and utility in the application of power. This grouping lacked a critical analysis of how power was structured in relations. This grouping qualified power through its political-military and legal forms and institutional arrangements yet did not assume that these forms of power expressed through the status-quo institutional arrangements also contributed to origins of the conflict.

Yet, there was a limited quantity of research that discussed the impact of Track II/III actors applying other forms of mediation. (“CONAIE Calls for a Cease Fire” n.d.; “Indigenas Proponen Parque Binacional Fronterizo” n.d.; Hancock and Mitchell 2007b; “Breaking the Cycle of Violent Conflict with Johan Galtung - YouTube” n.d.; Cui 2014). These works, with the exception of Hancock and Mitchell, are not located in academic contexts. Galtung’s seminar, “Breaking the Cycle of Violent Conflict” was sourced from youtube. CONAIE Calls for a Cease Fire and “Indigenas Proponen Parque Binacional Fronterizo” originated from newspaper archives. Typically data sourced from youtube and newspaper archives is considered unscholarly, hence the subaltern categorization used by this investigation.

As a result of the differences emerging, my inquiry labeled the differences and similarities. The differences between the hegemonic and subaltern groupings; hegemonic discourse discusses Track I processes and actors. Leveraging was achieved through diplomatic top-down institutional channels.

Luigi Einaudi, the U.S. representative to the Peace Process, functioning in his role of the Guarantor of the Rio Protocol featured prominently as a reference source. Other major English language works by Mares and Palmer and Herz and Nogueira, which assess the EPPP, also heavily rely and reference Einaudi's narrative of events.

My inquiry questioned the EPPP archive for other sources from other institutional actors in the guarantor role. What does the Brazilian /Chilean /Argentinean diplomat have to say about Einaudi's narrative? Or what do these other mediators have to say about Crocker's interpretation of 'borrowing of leverage' or his attribution of success to leveraging? The EPPP archive does not contain other English language actor narratives with the exception of Herz and Nogueira's who referred briefly referred to and acknowledged these sources.

My analysis includes an attempt to mediate the differences amongst the mediators' and researchers' narratives. This analysis includes an assessment of the impact of the mediators' and researchers' assumptions in their respective narratives and an exploration of their respective positions and biases. Having followed the first two phases of NM which Winslade calls "engagement and deconstructing the conflict-saturated story", my inquiry proceeded to construct the alternative story (Winslade 2001, 58).

The difference in the advocacy of mediation forms (Leveraging/Bridging) and the different scopes on mediation Tracks and actors forced my inquiry to examine the final comprehensive settlements (the Presidential Act of Brasilia of 1998), the political institutional arrangements that signaled the conclusion and political-legal outcomes of the EPPP.

The comprehensive settlements, a brief analysis

Multi-party and multi-track mediators addressed the interests and deep-rooted conflict between Ecuador and Peru. After three years of confidential multi-party and multi-track mediated interactions, the outcomes of the Peace Process in the form of legal settlements emerged. Ecuador acquired legally protected commercial and navigation rights on a tributary of the Amazon River within Peruvian territory, permitting Ecuador to have rights on the Amazon and thus access to the Atlantic Ocean. This access to the Amazon can be considered as satisfying one of Ecuador's national identity needs; its international legal and political recognition of its proud Amazonian heritage.(Herz and Nogueira 2002, 17).

Aside from the cessation of inter-nation state violence, as was accomplished through MOMEF and detailed in the history section of this paper, the final political settlements accomplished a transformation of the conflict centered on the border dispute. The final political settlements feature an atypical outcome of the Peace Process, namely the establishment of a bi-national zone. This zone is described in the final comprehensive settlements as consisting of "54.4 square kilometers of adjacent ecological reserves freely transitable by members of native communities and coordinated by the help of private nonprofit organizations" (C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999b, 425). This bi-national zone, a crucial component and outcome of the EPPP, is important to consider in the transformation of the Ecuador and Peru border conflict and therefore it is also important to consider in assessment and attribution literature.

If the Rio Protocol of 1942 attempted to embed Peace into the conflict system, the bi-national zone succeeded in establishing peace infrastructure.

While this zone is acknowledged in the narratives and assessments in the hegemonic Post-Conflict Intervention literature, data on the origins/source of this crucial component of the EPPP are excluded and obscured in the majority of the academic discourses on the EPPP. Johan Galtung implies in his various discourses that he passed the idea of the Peace zone/park to military generals and ex presidents (“Breaking the Cycle of Violent Conflict with Johan Galtung - YouTube” n.d.; Galtung 2002).

Keeping in mind that mediation requires a code of secrecy by all participants, Galtung in this instance breached the code of secrecy in mediation to inform mediation scholars of the utility of bridging. Galtung was not officially involved or recognized within the institutional track 1 diplomatic process neither was he a representative of the Rio Protocol guarantor nations. His exclusion in the discourse of these diplomatic political-institutional actors is the object of this inquiry. Galtung implies that he communicated with high-ranking representatives of both the political and military institutions of Ecuador and Peru. The inquiry interrogates the presence of Galtung’s bridging mediation, and challenges the hegemonic discourse position, by asking if bridging mediation in fact significantly impacted a component of the EPPP final comprehensive settlements, why is this impact not acknowledged or assessed? Galtung’s radical geographic solution for the actual border-dispute, a bi-national zone, represents a solution that threatens the hegemonic position’s worldview/ideology. This solution deconstructs and disassembles normalized nation-state political and international relations and threatens the prestige of those actors who construct international relations norms.

The bi-national zone excludes the negative impacts of political-military-institutionalized and track 1 institutional actors and top-down processes on that geographic territory. International and institutional legal norms do not apply in that bi-national zone. This component of the final settlements which redefines the historical nation-state land claims as “adjacent ecological reserves freely transitable by members of native communities” – also led the inquiry to investigate how grass-roots, and Track III processes interacted during the EPPP multi-party mediations. The final settlements included the generation of a new form in international legal agreements between Ecuador and Peru. This new legal modality first codifies and normalizes Ecological reserves in the legal discourse of political-institutional actors. Former geo-political land claim relations between Ecuador and Peru were constructed on out-dated roman-legal traditions. In the case of the Ecuador and Peru, these out-dated legal traditions provoked the violence between these two nation-states. The new legal modality that the EPPP created was a new legal instrument that formalized and legitimized non-political forms of non-nation-state sovereignty. The fact that an international dispute was transformed by non-institutionalized interveners, who acted outside the institutional circuits of resolving land claim disputes threatens the prestige of the institutional actors and channels. Non-institutional alternative legal and political formulations are not emphasized in the discourse of those academic researchers in the hegemonic position.

Does this alternative mode of international relations represent a threat to the dominant worldview/ideology of political realists? Normalized geo-political-legal land claim relations involve one side conceptually asserting dominance and winning the claim. In the EPPP formulation, an alternative form of geo-political

land claim resolution negates the negative influence of political instruments/ structures. This new modality of legal relations assembles new norms of international relations while disassembling the old norms. Secondly, the new international legal form transforms relations with indigenous communities, inherently recognizing those whose lands were divided and claimed as sovereign first under Spanish colonial administration and later by institutionalized/ structured nation-state political arrangements. The new international legal code acknowledges these Indigenous communities by recognizing and explicitly granting positive legal rights to members of native communities to “freely transit” this new form of non-political administration of non-nation state territory.

The protected 100 square kilometers of non-nation-state ecological reserve located in the highlands of the dense Amazonian jungle represents a new form of international relations. This formulation of international legal recognition for land claim disputes destabilizes political realist assumptions about the utility of accumulation and exerting power and force and this alternative form of conflict resolution threatens those who subscribe to the norms of the nation-state political and administrative relations.

The subaltern story was also constructed with data that did not originate in the academic literature. My archive expanded to collect all references to the EPPP from all sources. Newspaper articles and Internet websites were included in addition to academic literature on the EPPP in the archive. COICA (La Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indigenas de la Cuenca Amazonica) proposed a “parque indigena binacional en una zona desmilitarizade” as an alternative to the escalating violence between Ecuador and Peru in 1994. This proposal released

by the InterPress Third World New Agency (IPS). (“Indigenas Proponen Parque Binacional Fronterizo” n.d.)

CONAIE (Confederacion de Nacionalidades Indigenas Del Ecuador) also proposed, in their call for a cease fire on January 31,1995, a very similar idea publishing the following idea,

“In order for the border to be secure one must remember that people live there. Placing the resources and territories in the hands of indigenous peoples are a sufficient guarantee for the peace and integrity of the area. This means a definitive legalization of the territory on the part of the two countries in favor of the Indigenous Peoples”(“CONAIE Calls for a Cease Fire” n.d.).

The origins of the bi-national zone component of the final settlements are not conclusive. This study cannot confirm if the idea originated with Galtung or if Galtung communicated the CONAIE idea in his discussions with the institutional elite of Ecuador and Peru. However, the origins of the bi-national zone component are not important. What this inquiry finds as important is how the origins of this component are not discussed and generally excluded in the academic literature. Moreover, with respect to the Research Questions, NM was helpful in deconstructing the EPPP archive into two discourses that exhibited competition and conflict. Although ideology is not directly traced in NM, the NM method helped identify at least two forms of mediation that were operational during the EPPP. With respect to research question 5, “When did mediators first employ Leveraging?”, the historical research suggests that leveraging has been operational in one form or another in the EP conflict system since other nations

have tried to arbitrate in the dispute. The year 1803 appears as a date when leveraging was applied (See Palmer/Mares's account in the timeline).

With respect to research question 6, "When did mediators first employ bridging?", the historical research suggests that bridging has been operational in the EP conflict system since 1994 or 1995. With respect to research question 8, "Who is doing PCI assessments of the EPPP?", The NM approach helped identify that scholars from the Political Science and International Relations disciplines hold the hegemonic position in the academic literature. With respect to research question 9, "What are the assessor assumptions/positions?", the NM method clarified how the disciplines of Political Science and International Relations share a theoretical orientation in Political Realism. The inquiry interrogates this theoretical orientation for its impact on the assessment literature and questions how worldview, identity, and ideology are related. With respect to research question 10, "What is the assessor's Academic discipline?", Political Science and International Relations form a strong complex that effects the frames of analysis in the EPPP.

The Data and analysis that Narrative Mediation provides is helpful, this approach deconstructs the EPPP academic discourse into two narratives, the hegemonic and the subaltern, yet it does not fully answer the research questions and the inquiry applies Discourse Analysis as a method to help clarify some of the data and results of the NM analysis.

Discourse Analysis

The Discourse Analysis method of subject positioning requires interpreting the ways texts "work to create a knowable reality by linking

subjects and objects to one another” (Dunn and Neumann 2016, 112). Under this framework of analysis the researchers and authors of the EPPP texts are included as the subject of study. Dunn and Neumann encourage the analyst to examine relationships in the discourse, how these “relations are established through the construction of a subject positioning based on opposition or similarity” (Ibid, 112). The inquiry focuses on the similarities in the discourse amongst those texts and researchers in the hegemonic position.

All texts in the hegemonic position analyzed institutional actor’s use of power and traced Track I channels, almost exclusively examining top-down processes. Crocker, Hampson and Aall relied heavily on Luigi Einaudi as a source for their claims on the impact of leveraging in the EPPP. Examining the position of Einaudi required an examination of his narrative.

In the “Herding Cats” mediation case study, Crocker, Hampson et All exclusively employ Einaudi’s narrative of the 1995-1998 of the EPPP. They use his narrative to demonstrate their claims of the effectiveness of leveraging in mediation in the “Shifting sands” article . When Einaudi explains how he became involved, there is little doubt that he is ideologically oriented toward Political Realism. Einaudi writes,

“Alec Watson asked if I would agree to represent the U.S. in a continuing guarantor effort. I answered with two questions of my own. Was our objective just to stop the shooting? Watson answered that everyone wanted to go for a permanent fix if one could be found. My second question was whether anyone would object if my first call was to General Barry McCaffrey, then the commander in chief of the U.S. Southern Command? A permanent fix would be unthinkable

without military support”(C. A. Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1999, 410).

Certainly Einaudi’s theoretical orientation centered on the top-down application and desire to accumulate force and power in his international relations approach puts him in the Political Realist school of thought.

Upon careful examination of Einaudi’s notes, note 28 refers to Einaudi’s assessment and attribution: “Every step of the way, they (the presidents of Ecuador and Peru) insisted that needed and wanted a ‘global and definitive peace’. With the help of mutually compatible aides (note 28), they reviewed together the cumulative work of the previous three years” (Ibid, 424).

The note 28 reads,

“Enormous credit must go to Foreign Ministers Fernando de Trazegnies of Peru and Jose Ayala Lasso of Ecuador and their teams. Peru’s ambassador to Washington, Ricardo Luna, and Ecuador’s chief negotiator, Edgar Teran, sustained everyone in the darkest months of 1996 and 1997. Enrique Iglesias, president of the Inter-American Development Bank, was a constant source of encouragement and support. Private citizens who made critical contributions include Ecuador’s Ivonne A-Baki.... and Harvard Professor Roger Fisher...”(Ibid, 429).

My inquiry questions the exclusion of credit and acknowledgement by Einaudi to Johan Galtung and Indigenous collectives, both non institutionally aligned mediator actors representing alternative Track II/ III forms and channels of mediation are excluded from this reference in Einaudi’s notes. Einaudi acknowledges “private citizens who made critical contributions”, yet the

Indigenous collectives and Galtung are not included in Einaudi's list. Einaudi only acknowledges elite private citizens. This inquiry points to this form of exclusion as patterned and perpetuated in the academic literature.

Mares and Palmer and Herz and Nogueira also exhibit this tendency as well. They only credit and acknowledge the institutional actors, while excluding the significant contribution of Galtung and the Indigenous collectives to the successful outcome of the border dispute. This paper suggests that credit and acknowledgement for the successful outcome of the EPPP are withheld from Track II/III sources. Track II/III sources, in this case, successfully dismantled an out-dated and dysfunctional legal norm anchored with an assumption that an overt display of nation-state power and force was the only way to solve the border dispute. These Track II/III actors and processes because of their success in the EPPP represent a threat to the prestige of the institutional actors/processes and as a result they are excluded from credit and acknowledgement.

Certainly as an institutional operative in the EPPP, Einaudi was aware of these non-institutional operatives, their interactions and their influence. This inquiry interrogates this erasure of non-institutional operatives and demonstrates that assessment material of a PCI requires a solid data collection method. Without a thorough historical data collection method, PCI literature makes flawed claims as in the case of the EPPP with leveraging.

The works of Mares and Palmer also exhibit this tendency to exclusively examine Track 1 institutional actors, power and top-down channels while excluding and erasing the contributions of alternative Track II/III forms and

non-institutional mediator actors. Power, Institutions and Leadership in War and Peace: Lessons from Peru and Ecuador 1995-1998 represents a detailed account of the top-down processes of EPPP but the research of David R. Mares and David Scott Palmer also excludes crucial details with respect to the study of mediation and leadership in Peace. In the preface of their work, they write,

“we want to note our particular gratitude to Luigi Einaudi, U.S. representative to the guarantors under the Rio Protocol; to Ecuadorean diplomat and scholar Francisco Carrion Meana...to the Peruvian and Ecuadorean ambassadors to the U.S., Ricardo Luna and Edgar Teran, ...to Gen. Francisco “Paco” Moncayo...and to Gen. Jose Williams and to the former president of Ecuador Jamil Mahuad... Each gave us additional perspectives and insights that added important details to our analysis.” (Mares 2012b).

Again, my inquiry questions the patterned exclusion and erasure of bottom-up and Track II/III processes and actors in Palmer and Mares’s data. This exclusion is similar to Einaudi’s narrative’s exclusion in Crocker, Hampson, and Aall work on the EPPP, Herding Cats: multiparty mediation in a complex world. As previously stated, the exclusion is structured in the discourse. Trajfel and Turner’s theory of Intragroup conflict suggests that prestige and competition for scarce resources are behind the narrative conflict. Golpen and Plant’s studies on worldview suggest that a worldview challenge/threat are behind the narrative avoidance and discursive derogation of these other Track II/III processes.

In assigning a subject position to these authors, the first word in the title of their work “Power” is helpful in delegating these authors as belonging to the Political Realist school of thought and the Realist position. In the introductory

chapter, these authors reveal their narrow scope of analysis with headings such as: Domestic Institutions, International Institutions, Power and Institutions, Political leadership and Statecraft. In the conclusion to the introduction, Mares and Palmer write, "It is our perception that the war, subsequent peace, and the ultimate resolution of the conflict between Ecuador and Peru are best understood as a rational process in which both domestic and international factors played fundamental roles at every step" (Mares 2012, 26). Yet, they do not fully explore the domestic factors, only examining the domestic institutional political factors.

In identifying key factors, which their research centers on, Mares and Palmer claim, "A key factor that we have identified for conflict resolution is the operation and effectiveness of domestic institutions. At the moment the outbreak of hostilities between Ecuador and Peru occurred, both countries had functioning if imperfect democracies" (Ibid, 27). This claim functions to unquestionably confirm the crucial role of political institutions. However, my research indicates that this specific claim requires a deeper historical exploration into the dysfunctions of their respective democracies. Citizen groups policing the country-side in Peru in addition to political chaos resulting from the suspension of the constitution do not represent a functioning democracy. Mares and Palmer themselves seem to offer contradictory evidence to this claim later in writing,

"As noted in Chapter 3, the armed forces were the most respected institution in (Ecuador) during this period, far outdistancing either congress or the presidency. Popular support provided a major basis for military influence in politics, but the historical record does not

suggest that presidents perceived that the military was keeping them on a tight leash with respect to the territorial dispute” (Ibid, 77).

This data subtly functions to destabilize Mares and Palmer’s previous claims in the Introduction, which attribute “a key factor” (to the outcome) of the Conflict Resolution processes to “the operation and effectiveness of domestic institutions” in Ecuador.

Research by Jennifer Langdon and Mery Rodriguez also suggests that the Peruvian domestic (political) institutions were also dysfunctional. These authors describe the *rondas campesinas* (peasant patrols) of Peru, as “one of the largest and most sustained rural movements in late-twentieth century Latin America” (Hancock and Mitchell 2007, 91). The authors describe the *rondas campesinas* as “nightwatches, organized by local leaders in the towns of northern Peru to protect the inhabitants of the towns from increasing danger caused by thievery and violent crime” (Ibid, 91). The authors note how other researchers credit “the presence of the *rondas* as a significant factor in the defeat and/or containment of the insurgent group Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) in Peru’s 1980 to 2000 civil war” (Ibid, 91). These *rondas* “make up an organized force that advocates on behalf of campesinos and other oppressed populations in the country” (Ibid, 91). The authors suggest that the *rondas* “can be studied in juxtaposition to other grassroots, social movements” (Ibid, 91). The *rondas* are socially significant factors in the analysis of domestic institutions of Peru. The authors claim, “The *rondas campesinas* are one example of peasant response to the inability of the state to meet the basic needs of the Peruvian population” (Ibid, 92). Clearly, neither Peru’s nor Ecuador’s domestic institutions were as effective and functional as Mares and Palmer’s claims suggest.

Mares and Palmer write, "A third key factor is the exercise of individual leadership and statecraft within the inevitable constraints of domestic and international institutions" (Ibid, 28). Again, this claim functions to unquestionably confirm the importance of these institutions to the outcomes of the EPPP. Later they write, "Within the multilateral mechanism of the guarantors, U.S. representative ambassador Luigi Einaudi served as the key actor" (Ibid, 28). All these claims demonstrate these researchers' bias and theoretical orientation and expose their subject position as containing an assumption that a single "key" is necessary and required for a successful conflict resolution. Mares and Palmer in addition to Crocker, Hampson, and Aall, imply that the institutional actors representing the nation-state are the generators and catalysts of conflict resolution processes.

Later in their work, in chapter six entitled "Hemispheric Diplomacy and the Politics of a Solution", the authors attribute a component of the final comprehensive settlements of the Peace Process to Einaudi. They write,

"By all accounts, Einaudi played an indispensable role throughout the process. He is credited by various key actors with everything from finding ways to express issues that would not offend either party....to coming up with the private property idea for Tiwintza that opened the way to the breakthrough needed for resolution.(note 22). Both parties came to trust his judgment, his fairness....and his discretion. The general conclusion among participants is that without his...involvement the Ecuadorean and the Peruvians would never have signed and ratified an agreement. (note 23). Ambassador Einaudi's participation confirms the adage that diplomacy transcends

cold calculations of costs and benefits, balance points, and game theory – individuals do make a difference” (Mares 2012, 115).

Exploring the notes to this text reveals that even this attribution is not a stable claim: “ note 22. Former president of Ecuador Jamil Mahuad, however, indicated that he was the one who originally made this novel proposal as a way to make a final agreement more acceptable to key actors and the public in Ecuador (Palmer interview, July 11, 2008).”

This analysis interrogates claims that are made in the academic literature such as, “a breakthrough needed for resolution”, why is the private property idea for the Tiwintza component of the final settlements assessed as the single component that opened the way to a breakthrough?

Neither, Mares and Palmer nor, Crocker, Hampson and All trace the origins of the solution to the central issue of the conflict, the disputed border territory. Both these major works in the academic literature on the EPPP exclude the subaltern narrative of events and this patterned erasure is extremely problematic for future researchers and mediators.

Examining note 23 reveals that, “These tributes to Ambassador Einaudi were among those made by presidents Alberto Fujimori of Peru and Jamil Mahuad of Ecuador at a ceremony attended by Palmer in Washington D.C., in February 1999 to bestow on Dr. Einaudi their countries’ highest medals to foreign citizens” (Ibid, 163). This inquiry’s analysis of the academic discourse interrogates the asymmetry in attributions in assessment literature. This analysis does not attempt to disqualify Einaudi’s achievements but this inquiry questions the use and over reliance of his narrative to present of historical facts..

Mares and Palmer briefly trace the impact of the subaltern position, referring to the Indigenous collectives contribution to the EPPP, writing:

“Ecuadorean civil society is well organized and willing to engage in pressure group activity independently from its representatives in congress. A group of indigenous communities that had begun to organize in the 1980s, the Confederacion de Nacionalidades Indigenas del Ecuador (CONAIE, Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador), went on a national strike in 1991 to call attention to their economic and political plight. By 1996 they had become an important political party, Pachacutik. Student groups, business associations, and unions went on a national strike in 1997 to protest against President Bucaram’s administration. Mass demonstrations in the main plaza of Ecuador’s capital, Quito, became a common occurrence” (Ibid, 77).

This quote not only functions to further contradict their previous claims for “the operation and effectiveness of domestic institutions” in Ecuador but this quote also excludes attributions to this groups generation of the bi-national zone idea that later became a key component of the final settlements of the EPPP. CONAIE claims that they proposed the bi-national zone as a solution to the border dispute but this contribution is not examined in the work of Mares and Palmer.

The research in Ecuador vs. Peru : Peacemaking Amid Rivalry is the most balanced and broad exploration of the EPPP yet it still exhibits traits assigned to the hegemonic position for the purpose of this study, namely the singular examination of nation-state actors and processes and the tracing of Track I, Institutional top-down channels with the exclusion and erasure of Track II/Track

III impacts. This text shares similar qualities of the other major works on the EPPP. In the introduction, the authors write:

“Among the guarantors, certain personalities may have had a particularly central role in pushing the process forward and, at some critical junctures, in presenting alternatives that contributed to overcoming significant impasses: the names of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso of Brazil; Ambassador Luigi Einaudi, special representative for the U.S.; and Ambassador Ivan Canabrava, chief negotiator for Brazil, come to mind. However, as we are more concerned with the effectiveness of the mechanism of conflict resolution, we will look at the comprehensive role of the guarantors as a group in context of the mediation process rather than concentrating on individual countries or personalities” (Herz and Nogueira 2002, 15).

Although these researchers promise to go beyond the typical traits of the hegemonic narrative, they ultimately do not venture off the Track I/top-down emphasis. They write:

“The analytical perspective adopted here, and discussed in more detail below, considers domestic variables in explaining the outcome of the negotiation and mediation processes. The participation of civil society organizations in domestic debates that contributed to a gradual change in positions regarding the conflict in Ecuador, for instance, is an important factor in our analysis of the redefinition of interests and identities enabling agreement” (Ibid, 15).

If the authors are indeed referring to the impact of CONAIE, or other Track II/III grassroots movements in Ecuador, as “the participation of civil society

organizations that enabled agreement”, unfortunately their discourse does not identify these organizations by name.

While their discourse in the introduction continues to focus on the scope on the typical institutional actors/processes it also further destabilizes Mares and Palmer’s claims about “the operation and effectiveness of domestic institutions.” Herz and Nogueira write,

“We will see how the internationalization of the process through mediation mechanisms within the Rio Protocol contributed, in both countries, to insulate the influence of sectors resistant to an agreement within the military and foreign services. The negotiating framework also crucially insulated the process from the destabilizing pressures of serious domestic turmoil during the negotiating period, particularly in Ecuador” (Ibid, 15).

Clearly, the authors’ use of the words “internationalization of the process through mediation mechanisms” refers to the top-down scope of their analysis. The difference in this work is that the authors acknowledge the use of several intervention strategies, specifically mentioning “civil society participation”. However, they do not specifically name the Indigenous collectives or the participation of Galtung. Herz and Nogueira identify “lines of communication between official negotiations and nonofficial contacts” as being “useful”, however this claim in their work is ambiguous (Ibid, 101). This claim could be supported by mentioning Galtung and CONAIE by name and furthermore by identifying that the bi-national zone component of the final settlements originated from these nonofficial actors. The pattern of exclusion of the contributions of Galtung and CONAIE to the EPPP is repeated in this work.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Unifying Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with a Genealogical approach allows for an examination of the intertextuality of the different and distinct discourses in the EPPP archive. This method examines the shared links, connections and commonalities between the different texts, specifically in terms of how these different texts and the knowledge contained within these texts are constructed. This method examines the shared references and common source material of the different texts. CDA examines the sources and references of the material that is constituted as the text. Both methods interrogate the history of the discourse and how knowledge is informed by discourse.

Applied to the EPPP archive, CDA and Genealogy approaches reveal the significant influence and impact of Luigi Einaudi's narrative on assessment material of the EPPP. The influence of Einaudi's narrative is pervasive amongst the EPPP texts in the hegemonic position and this narrative misinforms mediator and researcher knowledge of the EPPP. Crocker, Hampson and Aall make their leveraging claims in "Shifting Sands..." based totally on Einaudi's narrative of the EPPP in the other Crocker, Hampson et Aall text, Herding Cats. Einaudi was the U.S. representative and acted on behalf of the U.S. in its role of guarantor of the Rio Protocol. However, his role as a mediator was part of a team of multiparty mediators. The CDA inquiry helps reveal that the other mediators and other representatives from guarantor nations (Brazil, Chile, Argentina) were not referred to in the texts of Crocker, Hampson and Aall. This inquiry questions what these other mediators would attribute the successful outcome of the EPPP to.

Certainly, these other mediators and representatives from guarantor nations have their own assessments of the EPPP and their own attributes for the successful outcome of the mediated process. Would they all unanimously say that the borrowing of leverage was the sole and most important factor to the transformation of this conflict? This inquiry interrogates the absence and exclusion of these other multiparty mediators and questions why and how these other representatives were not referenced in the Crocker, Hampson and Aall texts.

Crocker, Hampson and Aall's attributions of success due to leveraging in the EPPP are flawed first, due to the exclusion of crucial historical data. This exclusion of data as evidence to substantiate the claims to the impact of leveraging is flawed. Conflict analysis demonstrates that exclusionary behavior and cognitive processes occur when groups are in conflict. Worldview studies and frameworks also suggest that avoidance [of data in this case] is a cognitive byproduct in reaction to worldview threats. This pattern of exclusion and avoidance of historical data negatively affects these authors' decision-making process, which negatively impacts their assessments and attributions of success in the EPPP. Furthermore, the framework of their assessments indicates that these academic researchers are motivated and impacted by their ideology, as will be discussed in the next section.

Crocker, Hampson and Aall are not the only EPPP authors in the hegemonic position who exclusively refer to and analyze one mediator's narrative of events in the EPPP mediation process. Mares and Palmer in Power, Institutions, and Leadership in War and Peace: Lessons from Peru and Ecuador, 1995/1998 also exhibit this tendency to exclusively refer and rely on one mediator's narrative.

Although Mares and Palmer do not make attributions to the leveraging form of mediation they do emphasize the important and impactful role that Institutional actors and processes played in the EPPP. In the preface of their work, they demonstrate this research bias in writing:

“While our debt to these individuals is acknowledged in the citations sprinkled throughout the chapters, we want to note our particular gratitude to Luigi Einaudi.....(who) gave us additional perspectives and insights that added important details to our analysis” (Ibid x).

In writing this statement in the initial chapter, they admit that other multiparty mediators’ perspectives have been excluded and in their work. They write, “within the multilateral mechanism of the guarantors, U.S. representative ambassador Luigi Einaudi served as the key actor” (Mares 2012, 28). Later in their work again, they pay tribute to Einaudi by writing, “While all of the guarantor representatives were highly qualified individuals, the particular abilities of one, Luigi Einaudi of the United States, stood out” (Ibid, 114). Again on the next page, these authors highlight Einaudi’s impact. In the previous section, I cite these authors’ reliance on Einaudi’s narrative of events in the EPPP. Mares and Palmer continually praise and highlight Einaudi’s impact in stating, “Ambassador Einaudi’s participation confirms the adage that diplomacy transcends cold calculations of costs and benefits, balance points, and game theory – individuals do make a difference” (Ibid, 115). This research does not attempt to disqualify Einaudi’s role and impact on the EPPP but it does intend to broaden the range of attribution. Broadening the range of attribution is very important to this project because other factors also impacted the outcome of the EPPP and these other factors deserve to be calculated and measured in future

Post-Conflict Intervention impact assessments. Broadening the range of attribution allows for the recognition of bottom-up momentums, which clearly impacted the outcomes of the EPPP.

If the EPPP is to have an objective analysis, why do several researchers and authors rely on and refer to only one mediator participant's narrative/discourse when all these researchers acknowledge that the EPPP was a multiparty mediation process? Mobilizing one mediator's narrative while silencing the other multiparty mediator narratives, containing references to alternative forms of mediation, reinforces the practices of only one mediator actor. Mobilizing one mediator's practice at the exclusion of the other mediator practices has an effect on the value of that mediator's epistemological structures employed to create and perpetuate that discourse.

David Scott Palmer's article, another text that takes the hegemonic position, entitled "Peru-Ecuador Border Conflict: Missed Opportunities, Misplaced Nationalism, and Multilateral Peacekeeping" offers a deep historical data set that functions to contradict the narrow and short-sighted attributive claims to the impact of leveraging by Crocker, Hampson and Aall. Palmer's historical time line provides evidence and an outline of different cases of mediation and political institutional intervention detailing thirteen major initiatives, "from Cedula of 1802 to the Act of Lima of 1936" (Ibid, 117). Palmer's dataset provides evidence to the central argument of this inquiry, that the attribution of success in the EPPP exclusively as a result of mediator leveraging/manipulation is flawed. Leveraged mediation has a history of failure in the Ecuador Peru conflict and in the case of the 1995 interventions, Crocker et al. only measured the institutional application of this top-down process. Their framework excludes measurement of other

impactful actors and processes, such as those from the bottom up and especially the grass-roots channels of mediation.

The history of this border and land claim dispute includes a significant number of cases in which leveraging in one form or another was attempted. Palmer in fact details the history of mediator leveraging without directly using the word leveraging. Palmer identifies historic efforts of political mediators applying leveraging, detailing the efforts of both the U.S. and Spanish governments in 1827, 1910, 1924, 1934 and 1936-38 in their attempt to influence Ecuador and Peru to agree to a border settlement (Ibid 118). Palmer claims, “the ultimate result of these multiple failures of external mediation or arbitration was the 1941 war between the parties” (Ibid, 118). Palmer’s historical data can be used to demonstrate that leveraging, as a political form of mediation, has been employed several times in the history of this conflict, yet violence has also re-escalated after historical uses of this political form of mediation. In assessing and attributing only one form of mediation, these discourses make ‘claims to truth’ and “interact to form cascades of practice and to reinforce the discourse that they emanate from” (Anais, 125). In this case, the discourse misinforms and only contains the political application of power/force relations. The academic discourse and the historical narrative of impactful mediation forms is therefore negatively impacted by these texts in the hegemonic position, which exhibit a tendency to silence, exclude and erase references and sources to the other narratives containing the application of other forms of mediation that were operational simultaneously to Einuadi’s form of mediation.

Interrogating the history and prevalence of this form of mediation is this inquiry's attempt to "take issue with practices that appear to others [political realists in this inquiry] "to be given and necessary" according to Anais (Anais, 127). This investigation approaches leveraging/manipulation claims suspiciously and interrogates the certainty of these claims. This inquiry considers this form of mediation as a mundane and banal normalized institutional practice that is so 'widely accepted' that it is naturally deployed in the discourses of power relations. The automatic acceptance of this form of mediation manufactures and constructs its future applications. As a consequence of their realist assumptions [a focus exclusively on external force/power] these Realists "succumb to reductive attributions and traps, the so-called, 'law of the instrument', accredited to both Abraham Kaplan and Abraham Maslow. In its short version, it runs that 'if all you have is a hammer, then you tend to treat everything like a nail". Applied to realist mediators the saying might go, if all you have is force/power then you tend to exclusively examine sources of power/force. "Indeed, the most pernicious effect is that the means 'might affect our aims in a manner that can lead to the reinforcement of the usage of the same instrument" ((PDF) Realist Theories and Practice" n.d.,12). The law of the instrument highlights the shortcoming of realist assessments of the EPPP. In this case, political realists only seek and analyze the use of external force. This method examines the hegemonic position of the academic discourse not only for its descriptive qualities and objective position "reflecting social life" but also as capable of generating subjective qualities and normative positions capable of "constructing" social life.

Anais implies that discourse in a CDA/Genealogy approach represents both written and spoken speech acts and a framework for ordering and systematizing. These methods examine the foundational words, phrases and propositions, “on the basis of the simple function that they carry out in a general situation” (Anais, 128). This inquiry interrogates the “symbolic meaning associated with the oft-repeated word and phrase,” [leveraging/manipulation] and the recurrent political institutionalized “frame, narrative and cultural script” (Ibid, 128).

In suspiciously approaching the practice of leveraging with uncertainty and replacing this practice with the subaltern form of mediator bridging, this investigation “embraces contingency instead of looking for causes” (Ibid, 129). In mobilizing bridging as an additional impactful form of mediation, this inquiry resists the “imposition of a form of order or logic on the past”(Ibid, 129). Interrogating the imposition of leveraging as the exclusive impactful intervention permits this research to identify that political institutional power/force applied by these same actors is not a given.

Applying aspects of CDA and Genealogy to the academic discourse of the EPPP, this inquiry has followed the conventions. The literature review represents the ‘assembled archive’ suggested by Anais. This inquiry expands and integrates previous datasets mobilized by academic sources. This up-dated archive examines the “relational aspects of discourse”. CDA reveals relational patterns of the hegemonic and subaltern discursive formations and the tendency of the “discourse to articulate”(Ibid, 130).

This inquiry observes “the systematic nature of texts” in the hegemonic position to exclude and silence references and material of non-political/non-institutional and therefore non-normalized sources of momentum for

international conflict intervention. Academics who strongly adhere to International Relations disciplinary assumptions are threatened by evidence that alternative [Track II/III] actors and process have, in fact, significantly impacted an international conflict. Read through the T&T framework, these academics exclude evidence of grass-roots momentum and contributions to the EPPP because these academics are competing with the grass-roots collectives for prestige.

This inquiry follows the third convention of “reading for silence” associated with the method of CDA. This investigation considers the exclusion of the measurement of the bridging form of mediation in assessment and attributive discourses as a silence and rupture of the dataset. This silence from the hegemonic position has an adversarial and negative effect on mediation practice, knowledge and decision-making. The rupture in the hegemonic discourse alters the dataset, disrupting the balance, obscuring data originating from the subaltern position. This inquiry attempts to redress the asymmetrical discursive qualities that have emerged and descended in the Post-Conflict-Intervention multi-party mediator political assessment narratives of the EPPP. The concept of hegemonic emergence in the discourse allows this inquiry to appreciate the narrative movements as “the play of force/power relations all engaged in a fluid struggle” (Ibid, 130).

Anais writes that CDA takes a critical approach to the systemic nature of text and discourse, examining how it performs and interrogating its production and its generative qualities and questioning the discourse’s circulation. Genealogy strengthens CDA by analyzing the production and legitimation of textual and discourse materials, certainly the legitimation of assessment

materials circulated in academic contexts. This inquiry analyzes the final comprehensive political settlements between Ecuador and Peru – the Presidential Act of Brasilia 1998 as the document and this analysis reveals multiple political-economic settlements.

This inquiry's analysis of the document "uncovers the conditions of possibility" that is say, it considers the subaltern measurements of power [bottom up vs. top down channels] and subaltern narrative of impactful mediation. Anais refers to this process as a convention in CDA methodology (Ibid, 131). Anais claims "the regulation of textual production and legitimation operate in double sense" (Ibid, 131). This investigation of the academic literature of the EPPP analyzes how the normalization of leveraging [which represents the external application of force/power, and associated with the behavioral conditioning of threat/reward] is perpetuated and legitimized by the hegemonic position in the academic discourse on the EPPP. The "adherence to institutional conventions" reinforces the legitimacy of the discourse "and the institution that disseminates it" (Ibid, 131).

This inquiry interrogates the EPPP academic literature for institutional conventions and disciplinary symbolic representations. The academic texts and discourse "systematize more than just the presentation of information" (Ibid, 131). The academic EPPP texts have reductive qualities that narrow the scope and range of attribution. The academic texts limit measurements of power/force to the measurement of institutional applications. These texts and the discourse contain tropes. These tropes function to narrow and reduce the scope of attribution, i.e. "leveraging is the ticket." The political realists, in this case, also repeat other tropes with reductive qualities, i.e. "the key actor" appears

frequently in the EPPP academic discourse. These tropes function to highlight and emphasize a singular phenomenon, while silencing the impact of others. The academic discussion unites and seems to unanimously agree that institutionally deployed politicized actors mobilizing and applying external political power/force over passive conflict actors is the prescribed intervention norm in nation-state land claim/border disputes. However, the marginal and illegitimized discourse containing references to bridging and bottom up processes is obscured, silenced and even erased in the academic literature.

The academic discourse on the EPPP exhibits a tendency to adhere to the political realist ideology and theoretical orientation. The academic discourse advances manipulation of parties (through threat and reward tactics) and leveraged mediation as a “strict rule” and emerges as a policy recommendation legitimized by a flawed assessment process lacking measurements of non-institutional, non-political actors. These qualities of the academic discourse, “reconfigure the researcher’s findings,” affecting “the conceptual and political contents” which is contained in the discourse (Ibid, 131).

The CDA and Genealogy method analyzes the EPPP academic discourse “in terms of the institutional labour” it performs while questioning the function of each text in the archive. The rules of assessment and attribution in the academic literature have a tendency to reduce and exclude while adhering to political realist assumptions and frameworks of conflict analysis. This bias and assumption of the nature of conflict negatively impacts their evaluations of post-conflict interventions. The scope of the hegemonic position’s investigation and its range of attribution could be broadened by integrating subaltern scopes for sources of attribution.

The subaltern narratives claim that their discursive structures generated a significant outcome outlined in the comprehensive final settlements [Presidential Act of Brasilia], namely the bi-national zone. This outcome is significant because this form of settlement destabilizes political and institutional norms. The bi-national zone is also significant because this form of intervention disassembles a normalized nation-state legal instrument, *uti possedetis de jure* and delegitimizes nation-state territorial land claims creating new legal codes and administrative formulations. This new code, in the Ecuador-Peru context, attempts to mitigate and negate the negative impact of nation-state actors/processes on the ecologically protected land. The final settlement states that the bi-national zone is to be administrated by non nation-state agents. This administration of land by non-nation state agents represents a threat to the privileged status of the institutional actors, as though the political administration of nation-state territory is the exclusive territory of these institutionalized actors. Moreover, the formalized agreement to the administration of land by non-nation state agents represents a loss of prestige to the academic disciplines that are normally tasked with administrating nation-state lands and intervening in nation-state conflicts. International Relations is the academic discipline normally tasked with regulating international disputes. However, in this case, the assumptions inherent in this discipline [accumulate and exert power] proved to lead to re-escalating violence between Ecuador and Peru. In the case of the EPPP, the normalized remedy prescribed by International Relations proved fatally flawed and did not contribute to the peaceful outcomes of the border dispute.

Framing Bias

Entman's method of tracing bias in media discourse applied to the academic literature of the EPPP discourse analysis interrogates disciplinary and institutional biases and how these biases are framed in the discourse. The method also examines how these discursive structures communicate. This method suggests that ideology impacts and influences producers of discursive structures/data-sets/frames. This method implies that frames are influenced by ideological convictions/assumptions/theoretical orientations and that the frames require content/decision-making bias to operate and function. Entman suggests that frames and ideology mutually reinforce/sustain discursive structures. This method analyzes the priming and agenda-setting functions of discursive structures. Bias in the discourse functions to organize conceptions of political-economic power. Investigating "content bias" this inquiry examines academic literature that "favors one side rather than providing equivalent treatment to both sides in a political conflict" (Entman 163).

The EPPP academic literature, in its current state, generates misinformed and therefore flawed conclusions and results. A political realist slant and agenda primes the PCI literature. Both the EPPP academic literature and the EPPP PCI literature contain content bias in their claims that the powers of the institutional top-down channels of mediation exclusively transformed the Ecuador Peru conflict. Framing and Ideology impact these claims. The authors' attributions of success are made without equivalently outlining or examining the transformative powers of the grass-roots/bottom-up channels of mediation. The examination of bias requires interrogating the decision-making bias, which assesses the "motivations and mindsets" that policed the producers of the information, in this study the academics and researchers who constructed the

content of the discourse. (Ibid,163). As a result of the common denominator of motivation, highlighted in Entman's study and worldview studies, this inquiry links both worldview and ideology.

Framing Bias examines functional qualities of discourse, interrogating how discourse communicates and contains the potential to generate narrative conflict in this case. The method examines factors such as content and decision bias in academic research. The method examines academic research for priming, and agenda-setting in discourse which claims to be neutral and value free PCI assessment literature. The method originally examines how priming and agenda-setting impact the discourse in media studies however, this inquiry applies the method to investigate how priming and agenda-setting impact academic discourse. These impacts require analysis and assessment for their effect on post-conflict intervention assessment analytical frameworks. This is a case study of how political realist frameworks emerge as hegemonic and negatively impact the presentation and circulation of historical data in the EPPP archive. These frameworks mobilize slanted and limited datasets in their process of inquiry. These slanted datasets function to structure researcher positionality in the EPPP archive.

Framing Bias analyzes the academic discourse for its "role in distributing power" and how it functions in the development of the distribution of power; limiting: problem definition, causal analysis, moral judgment and remedy promotion.(Entman, 164/165). Specifically, this investigation takes issue with the remedy [leveraging] promoted as impactful to the outcome of the EPPP. The political realist framework limits "elements of perceived reality" and constructs a "narrative that highlights connections". This narrative frame functions to

communicate “a particular interpretation” (Ibid, 164). The interpretation communicates and functions to reinforce the remedy, which in this case is the external application of power, otherwise known as leveraging.

The Framing Bias methodology suggests that framing functions to form interpretations and preferences through priming. This inquiry demonstrates how political realist frameworks in the EPPP archive “prime” the academic discourse. Political realist frameworks highlight the connections between the application of institutional/Track 1 actors/processes and identify these as essential to the successful outcome of the EPPP. The academic discourse highlights Track I actors and their channels as historically connected to the peaceful outcome and the abatement of violence in the Ecuador and Peru land claim dispute. The highlighting of these institutional channels in the academic discourse of the EPPP has impacts on the effects of discourse. The highlighting of slanted datasets functions in “activating schemas that encourage the target audience to think, and decide in a particular way” (Ibid, 164). The hegemony of political realist position emerges in the EPPP academic archive. This position negatively impacts the academic discourse as a result of its setting of agendas in evaluative frames. These evaluative frameworks contain bias in “defining problems worthy of attention” (Ibid, 164). Defining problems and causes of problems requires meticulous precision. Dysfunctional academic discourse misinforming the reader on problem-solving methods, techniques and mistakenly identifying causes [of the peace in this case] effects diagnosis and prediction for intervention procedures. This promotion/prediction of leveraging can fail. This discourse can be labeled as *ceteris paribus* if other factors, such as the bridging form of mediation, can be found to have intervened and impacted

the EPPP. The Realist frames, in this case, do not allow/detect impacts of non-institutionalized mediators. The Realist agenda setting [implying that institutional actors/process alone] and realist priming [misinforming historical interpretations] function to make attributions and claims, highlighting the causes of problems. In the case of the EPPP, the realists suggest that institutionalized Track I actors caused the current peaceful situation by their use of leveraging between Ecuador and Peru. A misinformed causal analysis impacts policy with flawed recommendations.

One sided/biased datasets with slanted historical material is an instrumental use of a dataset and can be exercised strategically by elites. Entman suggests that scholars assess this instrumental use/application of academic discourse and distinguish between bias and slant in framing. He characterizes slant as “framing favoring one side over the other in a dispute” (Ibid, 165). This inquiry examines the EPPP archive for examples of consistent one-sided framing. Patterned slant persistent in the discourse implies that the producers of the discourse may be “systematically assisting certain entities” to manipulate behavior. The academic discourse may be helping “to distribute power to particular groups, causes or individuals” (Ibid, 165). Interrogating the identity of these entities systematically assisted by the patterned slant, this inquiry suggests that political realists are endowing themselves with undeserved prestige for the outcome of the EPPP and their discourse functions competitively for its claims of success of the outcome of the EPPP. These attributions are in fact flawed, impacted by slanted datasets which function to ‘prime’ researchers and mediators.

Identifying content bias in the discourse helps identify the interests of “holders or seekers of power”(Ibid, 165). This inquiry argues that the EPPP academic archive contains such content bias. The major works only trace the diplomatic actors’ usage of Track I mediation channels. Moreover, these same major works on the EPPP exclude Track II/III contributions to the peace process. This patterned exclusion of non-institutional actors and channels exhibits what Entman refers to as content bias. Orienting the inquiry on content bias in discourse studies “avoids irresolvable question about truth and reality” and focuses instead on the formation of framing “words and images” (Ibid, 166). Examining discourse slant, and recurrent patterned relations of slant allows for an analysis of the mobilization of bias (Ibid, 166). Discourse that mobilizes bias in assessment frameworks obscures the results of these investigative endeavors. Taken as a whole and submitted as academic research, these attempts at PCI assessments lack a thorough examination, assessment and analysis of history. These flawed PCI assessments lack considerations of alternative frameworks, which are more inclusive. These alternative [to political realist] frameworks are more capable to measure/detect/observe other forms of mediation. Although decision-making bias is inevitable, this inquiry examines the norms that guide the decision-making in data-collection and information processing of the hegemonic and subaltern discourse positions. The norms and rules of the hegemonic discourse influence the framing of academic texts. This inquiry interrogates the norms of political realist framing in academic discourse on the EPPP.

This inquiry applies the framing bias methodology to detect the impact of ideology in assessment narratives. Framing Bias analyzes evaluative standards

in media. This inquiry applies Framing Bias to analyze evaluative standards in academia. Entman suggests that the process of evaluating the evaluative standards reveals discourse slant. Discourse slant refers to discourse slanted “favorably toward the side regarded as most powerful, popular and unified” (Ibid, 167). If academic discourse contains slant toward the most powerful, and this discourse informs public practices, policies, ethics and these become codified and normalized and structured in relations, in effect academics are constructing codes and norms containing out-dated and primitive measurement frameworks. This inquiry’s frame considers the academic discourse on the EPPP as fragmentary and simplistic, especially with regard to the political realist frame of causal analysis in the EPPP. The hegemonic political realist framework is biased. Its flawed results cause the advancement of inaccurate and imprecise mediator procedure. The political realist frame does not detect/observe/measure impacts of alternative forms of mediation. The hegemonic position in the academic discourse of the EPPP is constructed on simplified and limited data collection and processing. Simplified, fragmentary discourse contains exclusions of data. This inquiry argues, as does Entman’s, that ideologies held by academics play a role in shaping their discourse (Ibid, 167). In Entman’s formula, “personal ideology combines with other forces responding to market incentives” in circulating the discourse (Ibid, 167). This inquiry cautions against the incentivisation of discourse in the academic market. If the incentive becomes the accumulation of power for academic disciplines or researchers, these market incentives and ideology have significant impacts on qualities of the discourse produced from these discourse actors. This inquiry argues that academic researchers and disciplines have a duty and an obligation to produce objective,

balanced, neutral and unbiased analytical frameworks. Moreover, this inquiry argues that the political realists analytical frameworks, in the case of the EPPP, promote flawed findings. The results of these flawed investigations may be mobilized to falsely inform future peace processes.

The framing bias method also examines decision biases. Decision-making (cognitive processes) informs evaluative standards. An outcome of the persistent convergence of biased content, and decision-making, with the “concentration of political skill and resources possessed by particular interests” impacts academic discourse frames. This may “consistently favor certain policy outcomes and political actors” (Ibid, 167). Framing bias methodology acknowledges that symmetric/ balanced forms of academic analysis and assessment without the influence of ideology and bias is difficult to sustain/achieve yet knowledge of “agenda setting, framing and priming” is important to integrate in addition to the narrative claims of the PCI academic assessment literature. Patterns of slant, bias, preferred policies and evaluative standards relay information in the discourse. Knowledge of these patterns and how they function is important for conflict analysis.

Other studies analyzing conflict and patterned relations reveal similar qualities. The similar qualities examined in the discourse include exclusion/ silencing/ avoidance of the other. The discourse of the hegemonic position considers power as both a scare-resource and prestigious in its scarcity. This discourse exhibits competitive behavioral qualities.

Framing Bias traces biased material in the content of discourse and traces biased evaluation in decision-making processes. Although it is not a precise science, nor does it not provide conclusive results, analyzing the frames of

discourse suggests ideology and values deeply impact the production and quality of academic discourse. This inquiry demonstrates how political realist frames construct and maintain and reinforce political realist ideology in the academic discourse on the EPPP.

This chapter has demonstrated how the academic discourse on the EPPP can be divided into two main discourses, one hegemonic and one subaltern. This chapter has analyzed the hegemonic discourse positionality, and its reliance on one mediator's narrative of historical events. This one narrative has been demonstrated to have a monumental impact on the discourse. In applying CDA and Genealogy approaches, this chapter examines the influence of the monumental discourse and the simultaneous exclusion of the other. Finally, this chapter traces how ideology and bias affect the framing of the discourse on the EPPP.

Synthesis: Chapter 5

SYNTHESIS/CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will discuss the conclusions of this inquiry. As a synthesis, this chapter summarizes the findings of this inquiry, revisiting the arguments introduced in the introduction and asserts that the patterned discursive relations in the EPPP academic literature archive resemble similar patterns of exclusion identified by T&T in Intergroup conflict and worldview frameworks. This chapter will synthesize the preceding chapters, which discussed how this inquiry analyzed the EPPP academic literature with the help of four methods, all considering the different qualities of the EPPP discourse.

In attempting to redress the asymmetries in the current status of the academic discourse in the EPPP, this inquiry demonstrates how the narratives of the EPPP contained within the PCI assessment literature operate with limited historical datasets and flawed discursive structures. These discursive structures

function to legitimize institutional actors and processes in bringing closure to and successfully transforming the Ecuador-Peru border dispute. The legitimization of institutional actors and processes is patterned in the academic literature. The discursive patterns in the EPPP archive mimic behavioral and cognitive patterns that are examined in conflict studies. These relational patterns have been defined under various frameworks such as: exclusion, avoidance, marginalization and erasure. Trajfel and Turner explore exclusion in Social Identity. Golpen and Plant explore avoidance in worldview studies.

Since the patterned relations in the EPPP archive suggest conflict amongst the different academic disciplines and researchers and their various forms of PCI assessment frameworks, this inquiry raises several important questions with respect to the assessment of outcomes in the EPPP. Considering the historical data collected and discussed in this paper, the hegemonic assessment frameworks could be improved with the addition of these following questions; How did the *many* forms of mediation operational during the EPPP *combine*? And how did this *combination of multiple mediation forms* impact the outcomes of the EPPP?

While the majority of the literature on the EPPP assesses the impact of Track I/top-down processes and actors while highlighting their application of one form of mediation, my inquiry also interrogates why and how other forms of mediation (Track II/III/bottom-up) are frequently excluded and therefore not assessed in the EPPP academic literature.

This patterned exclusion of other forms of mediation, and other Tracks in the academic literature generates even more questions; Are the frameworks and results of these previous EPPP assessments inaccurate? Does this exclusion of

historical data indicate a flaw in data collection method or does this exclusion signify even deeper social constructive behaviors and cognitive processes? An examination of the EPPP archive reveals that several researchers exclusively highlight the impact of Track I actors/processes while applying leveraging/manipulation in their singular investigation of top-down mediation. The majority of assessments trace the institutional actors and processes. This tracing of institutional actors and processes in PCI assessment material is patterned in the EPPP academic discourse. The scope of these assessments is narrow as the political assessors singularly focus on and attribute the institutional application of leveraging as the key to the successful outcome of the third party mediation process in the EPPP case. This inquiry demonstrates how political realist focus on institutionally exerted power on the conflict actors in the EPPP case impacts the criteria and frameworks in political realist PCI assessments.

Identifying hegemonic and subaltern narratives and discourses are essential steps in both Narrative Mediation and Discourse Analysis methodologies. However, the deconstruction of the EPPP archive, undertaken with Narrative Mediation, is only a structural analysis. To be complete, an accompanying functional analysis is required. This inquiry is an attempt to mediate the differences amongst the mediators' and researchers' narratives. This academic mediation requires an assessment of the impact of previous mediators' and researchers' a priori assumptions, biases and ideologies. This assessment of the impact of a researcher's ideology, contained within this inquiry, demonstrates how ideology effects the production of a narrative of a historical

event. By examining assessment material in this way, this inquiry exposes the emergence of positions and bias in PCI assessment material on the EPPP.

As a consequence of the group behavior evidenced by the discourse of those in the hegemonic position in the EPPP archive, the collective exclusion of the other, my inquiry attempts to assess the impact of political realist ideology on their assessments in the EPPP. The academic literature on the EPPP predominantly and exclusively focuses on institutionalized processes referring to only the roles and actions of these institutional actors and in doing so this discourse perpetuates the institutional application of leveraging/manipulation in mediation of international conflicts. These discourses function to obscure the application of other impactful forms of mediation that were, in fact, operational in the EPPP. Furthermore, these discourses silence other track mediators who were active during the EPPP. The focus on top-down processes excludes the analysis and consideration of the momentum generated by the bottom-up, grass-roots processes.

This inquiry argues that ideology impacts assessment frameworks and criteria, in addition to effecting data collection and the presentation and circulation of historical data. Ideology impacts research methodology similarly to the way worldview and identity have been demonstrated to function to exclude the other.

Many experts in the field of mediation may suggest that claims of attribution are not important when considering the successful outcome of a mediated process, however, when flawed claims of attribution are circulated, this creates a problem because in essence a remedy is falsely promoted.

The origins of the bi-national zone component of the final settlements are significant and must be considered in assessment materials. The bi-national zone functions to alter the legal and political forms of governing and administering nation-state lands. As a result of this difference, the bi-national zone alters institutionalized international norms. The bi-national zone component, which this inquiry suggests is the most significant element of the Presidential Act of Brasilia, functions to disassemble standardized, status-quo institutional nation-state norms. This inquiry argues that the disassembly of status-quo institutional nation-state norms represents a threat to the prestige of those researchers and mediators who are informed by the international relations discipline. This inquiry traces group behavior/cognition in response to this perceived threat.

This investigation asserts that the leveraging form of mediation could not be held accountable for the generation or the origin of the idea of the bi-national zone. While Galtung claims that the bridging form of mediation generated this idea for transforming the disputed territory, the researcher has to actually read Galtung to discover this, otherwise his contribution to the EPPP is totally erased by the discursive structures of those researchers occupying the hegemonic position in the EPPP archive. Even more troubling is that CONAIE's contribution is also totally erased by the discursive structures of those same researchers. While Galtung occupies the subaltern position and his discourse can be located in the academic discourse, CONAIE's discursive structures have no circulation in the academic literature. Even Galtung does not refer to this Indigenous collective who, for all intents and purposes, advocated the exact same idea, the bi-national

zone. In this case, CONAIE suffers a double erasure, an exclusion from the hegemonic academic discourse and even an exclusion from the subaltern academic discourse.

The political realists, in the case of the EPPP, ritually refer to other political realists in their research on the EPPP. As a result, a realist bias and ideology circulates freely in the academic literature, unchecked with no critique. The impacts of bridging and non-institutionalized forms of mediation are excluded, obscured, silenced and erased by the Post-Conflict Intervention assessment literature. The literature that occupies the hegemonic position exhibits a tendency to exclusively focus on political institutional interventions applied by political institutional actors and processes. The academic literature exhibits a narrow and reductive scope examining and measuring the impacts of external Track I diplomats in their role as guarantors to the Rio Protocol. Luigi Einaudi's narrative/discourse is used as historical reference material for authors in the hegemonic position, creating a monumental impact in the EPPP archive. The works of these authors are flawed because they do not examine or consider the impacts of other mediation track efforts (Track II/III/bottom-up) in their attributions of success in the outcomes of the EPPP.

The subaltern position in the EPPP academic literature assessment material has been excluded in the hegemonic position. The subaltern's position is that internal forces [grassroots collectives] within Ecuador and Peru also impacted the successful outcome of the EPPP. This inquiry's investigation into the historical material highlights that in addition to Galtung, two Indigenous collectives COICA and CONAIE both proposed a similar settlement/arrangement

to the disputed land claims between Ecuador and Peru. The bi-national zone is identified as a component of the final settlements in the literature of the hegemonic position, however the origins of this component are obscured, minimized, excluded and erased by the authors in the hegemonic position. The realist assessor must acknowledge the bi-national zone because it is enshrined in an international treaty, the Brasilia Accords. However, realist academics exclude any in-depth analysis of this fascinating new legal formulation.

In applying the Trajfel and Turner typology In Group/Out Group and framework to the EPPP archive, this inquiry considers the researchers who adhere to the political realist position as the In Group and the researchers who do not adhere to the realist position as the Out Group. In applying the Trajfel and Turner findings to the EPPP archive, this inquiry considers not only how the In Group excludes but also how they compete with the Out Group for prestige and scarce resources. This overt competition is exhibited discursively in the EPPP archive.

In applying the Golpen and Plant worldview study and framework to the EPPP archive, this paper considers the researchers in the hegemonic position as exhibiting avoidant and derogatory discursive behavior towards those in the subaltern position. In applying the Golpen and Plant findings to the EPPP archive, this paper considers how the hegemonic position may be motivated to maintain their worldview against perceived threats and violations to their worldview. This paper considers how the bi-national zone not only represents a worldview threat and violation to political realist worldviews and ideologies but also how the generation and origin of the idea of the bi-national zone represent a threat to institutionalized norms advocated by political realists.

Leverage

Touval and Zartman coined the term 'leverage' in their work *International Mediation in Theory and Practice*. They claim that in some situations, "the mediator may have to use its position and other available resources to manipulate the parties into agreement" (Touval and Zartman 1985, 12). They write, "The mediator as a manipulator requires leverage – resources of power, influence, and persuasion that can be brought to bear on the parties to move them to agreement" (Ibid, 12). Moreover, they claim, "leverage is the ticket to mediation—third parties are only accepted as mediators if they are likely to produce an agreement or help them out of a predicament, and they can only help the parties or produce an agreement if they have leverage" (Ibid, 12-13). In this case study of the EPPP, Crocker et al. rely and circulate Touval and Zartman's original usage of the term. Not only do they exclusively rely on Touval and Zartman's term, but they repeat the phrase, "leverage is the ticket" in their assessment of the EPPP. Leveraging becomes a realist trope in mediation studies.

Futhermore, while Galtung attempts to re-define classic/traditionalist conflict resolution mediator tools/methods, with the bridging form of mediation, the prestige of the realists appears to be threatened by this change in the status quo of mediation studies. The prescribed remedy embedded in realist nation-state intervention is the accumulation of power/force and the exertion of it upon the conflict actors. However, in the case of the EPPP, this form of intervention was operational but it was not the form of mediation that generated the peaceful outcome to the longstanding border dispute. Grassroots collectives, in addition to a Track II actor [Galtung] influenced the outcome of the EPPP. The EPPP

represents a case in which the failure of leveraged mediation was amended by the application of another form, that did not require the accumulation of nation-state power but in fact the opposite, the decrease of the exertion of nation-state power. The successful outcome resulting from this application of another form of mediation is what threatens the realists.

The shortcoming of the realist assessments of the EPPP is that these assessments depend exclusively on references to other realists. This type of analysis does little to inform researchers of the whole and complete and complex historical dataset. Another shortcoming of the realist assessments of the EPPP is that these evaluations exhibit the law of the instrument in that realists assume that power/force will resolve the conflict so they only examine actors and channels in which institutionalized power and force are contained.

Questions

It appears that ideology has a negative impact on shaping academic understanding of a conflict transformation process. It appears that ideology, similar to worldview, functions to impact a researcher's method of analysis. In the case of the EPPP, researchers with a political realist orientation exclusively refer to other researchers with that same orientation. This ritualized referencing exhibits a confirmation bias. Several forms of mediation were operational during the EPPP. While Institutional Track I mediators relied on leveraging/manipulation strategies, non-institutional Track II/III mediators relied on other mediation strategies. While Johan Galtung's form of bridging mediation was operational, those researchers in the hegemonic position exclude, silence and

discursively erase the effects of bridging and other forms of mediation.

Moreover, detailing the long history of this border dispute and the history of repeated attempts to resolve it, it appears as though leveraging had been attempted several times and in fact failed several times.

This paper reveals the challenges with qualifying mediation methods. Due to the confidential nature of mediation and the fact that in this case, multi-parties and multi-tracks were operational in the EPPP, this paper suggests that attempts to qualify mediation forms with a single word are wholly inadequate and not helpful for researchers or mediators. Based on the evidence on the EPPP archive, Post-Conflict Intervention assessments on the EPPP are undertaken by researchers informed by the International Relations academic discipline. This academic discipline is informed by a theoretical orientation and ideology and in the case of the EPPP assessments, the political realist ideology impacts analytical framework negatively, obscuring historical data and generating flawed meditation remedies and policy recommendations.

In conclusion, Post-Conflict Intervention assessments which function to make claims and attributions to the success of a particular form of mediation require in-depth and in-detail criticism and should not be taken at face value. These assessments, although frequently framed as objective, un-biased and value-free, can contain the embedded assumptions and ideological orientations of their authors and as such should be approached as narratives containing subjective value-laden assessments. Subjective, value-laden assessments prescribing remedies and policy recommendations in international conflict [leveraging in the case of the EPPP] can be socially and discursively constructed with the use of flawed historical datasets.

Works Cited

- Anaïs, Seantel. 2013. "Genealogy and Critical Discourse Analysis in Conversation: Texts, Discourse, Critique." *Critical Discourse Studies* 10 (2): 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.744321>.
- Bercovitch, Jacob, and Scott Sigmund Gartner, eds. 2009. *International Conflict Mediation: New Approaches and Findings*. Security and Conflict Management 3. London ; New York: Routledge.
- "Breaking the Cycle of Violent Conflict with Johan Galtung - YouTube." ———. n.d. Accessed October 9, 2017b. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=16YiLqftppo>.
- "CONAIE Calls for a Cease Fire." n.d. Accessed February 17, 2019. <http://ecuador.nativeweb.org/border/border5.html>.
- Crocker, Chester A., Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela R. Aall. 1999a. *Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

- Crocker, Chester, Fen Hampson, and Pamela Aall. 2015a. "The Shifting Sands of Peacemaking: Challenges of Multiparty Mediation." *International Negotiation* 20 (3): 363–88. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718069-12341313>.
- Cui, Shunji. 2014. "Conflict Transformation: The East China Sea Dispute and Lessons from the Ecuador-Peru Border Dispute." *Asian Perspective* 38 (2): 285–310.
- Dunn, Kevin C., and Iver B. Neumann. 2016. *Undertaking Discourse Analysis for Social Research*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Dyck, D. 2000. "The Mediator as Nonviolent Advocate: Revisiting the Question of Mediator Neutrality." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 18(2).
- Entman, Robert M. 2007. "Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power." *Journal of Communication* 57 (1): 163-173.
- Fishel, John T. 1998a. *The Savage Wars of Peace: Toward a New Paradigm of Peace Operations*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Galtung, Johan. 2002. *Searching for Peace: The Road to Transcend*. 2nd ed.. Peace by Peaceful Means. London ; Sterling, VA, London: Pluto Press, Pluto Press in association with TRANSCEND.
- Hancock, Landon E., and C. R. Mitchell. 2007a. *Zones of Peace*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Hansen, T. 2008 "Critical Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 25(4).
- Herz, Monica, and João Pontes Nogueira. 2002. *Ecuador vs. Peru: Peacemaking amid Rivalry*. International Peace Academy Occasional Paper Series. Boulder, Colo: L. Rienner.
- "Indigenas Proponen Parque Binacional Fronterizo." n.d. Accessed February 17, 2019. <http://ecuador.nativeweb.org/border/border3.html>.
- Korab-Karpowicz, W. Julian. 2018. "Political Realism in International Relations." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Summer 2018. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/realism-intl-relations/>.
- Mares, David R. 2012a. *Power, Institutions, and Leadership in War and Peace: Lessons from Peru and Ecuador, 1995/1998*. 1st ed.. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Meharg, Sarah Jane. 2009. *Measuring What Matters in Peace Operations and Crisis Management*. Kingston, Ont.: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.

- Palmer, David Scott. 1997a. "Peru–Ecuador Border Conflict: Missed Opportunities, Mislplaced Nationalism, and Multilateral Peacekeeping." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 39 (3): 109–148.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-2456.1997.tb00041.x>.
- "(PDF) Realist Theories and Practice." n.d. ResearchGate. Accessed February 15, 2019. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27394.58567>.
- Touval, Saadia, and I. William Zartman, eds. 1985. *International Mediation in Theory and Practice*. SAIS Papers in International Affairs, no. 6. Boulder : Washington, D.C: Westview Press ; Foreign Policy Institute, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.
- Wilkenfeld, Jonathan, ed. 2005. *Mediating International Crises*. Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics 34. London: Routledge.
- Winslade, John. 2001. *Narrative Mediation: A New Approach to Conflict Resolution*. 1st ed.. San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Zartman, I. William. 2005. *Peace versus Justice: Negotiating Forward- and Backward-Looking Outcomes*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.