### The Evolution and Causes of Territorial Peace in the Americas

#### **Appendix 4**

### Appendix D. The United States in Latin America post-1945

In considering whether US hegemony might be responsible for the convergence of the three key factors, we first consider whether US influence was present in negative cases (i.e., cases of no-militarization, no-democratization, and no-third party intervention). We then consider the five resistant cases that settled in the post-1945 era and explore to what extent US influence could have been influencing our factors of interest.

## 1. Failure

If Washington was driving resistant case settlement we should see some convergence between US policy change and our three factors of interest. This implies US influences should have been absent when the three factors – and thus the outcome – are absent. Nevertheless, US influences seem to be rather constant throughout long periods of time and sometimes working strongly against our conditions of interest.

### 1.1. US Preferences for Democratization

A literature on the role of the US in Latin American episodes of democratization considers regime related influences coming from Washington to be relatively uniform across the region instead of country-specific. Thus, it is unlikely that these would have affected only our cases of settlement and not others. Regime policies were unclear – and sometimes pro-authoritarian – from 1945 to 1977 with exception of the Truman (Bethell and Roxborough 1992; Schwartzberg 2003) and Kennedy (Smith 1991; Tulchin 1988) years – and largely pro-democratic from the Carter Administration onwards – with the possible exception of the early Reagan years (Acevedo and Grossman 1996; Carothers

1991; Handelman and Griffin Sanders 1981; Legler et al 2007; Lowenthal 1991; Mainwaring and Pérez-Liñán 2013; Robinson 2000; Sikkink 2004; Smith 1994; Whitehead 1986, 1996; Wiarda 1986). A recent study shows that even in periods when the US was insistently pushing for democratization, its causal impact is mixed. Only 9 out of 18 episodes of democratization happen post-1977 – i.e. during the most proactive era of democratic promotion during which the US be considered as having an important causal impact in the transition (Schenoni and Mainwaring forthcoming). Most transitions towards semi-democracy or democracy – i.e., those relevant to our analysis in figures 3 and 4 (see Mainwaring and Pérez-Liñán 2013) - tend to occur when the US does not offer clear support for democracy (1945-1977) precisely because intermittent breakdowns happen in that period as well. More consistent support for democracy from Washington post-1977 meant countries democratized once and for all in that period. Relevant for our analysis is that dyads with resistant disputes democratized the most when the US was not pushing for democratization, and only three out of ten resistant disputes settled – thus, only three out of our twenty countries democratized – in periods when the US was uniformly pushing for democracy in the whole region. For these reasons the impact the US is exercising through democratization proves very small.

# 1.2. US Preference for Settlement and Disposition to Facilitate

One might think that the US could change its policy toward particular dyad of countries in a particular moment, simply causing the settlement of a dispute by intervening. Our review of US-Latin American relations literature that deals more or less directly with territorial disputes and militarization, however, suggests that the US was invariably in favor of settlement in most of these cases and yet was wary to intervene, doing so only in specific instances where both parties looked for its support and such intervention would not harm the US strategically. In particular, anti-

Americanism was always a concern in a region that was very sensitive to Washington's intrusions (Atkins 1999; Bertucci 2013; Cottam 1994; Francis 1977; Kenworthy 1995; Kryzanek 1990; Lieuwen 1965; Long 2015; Lowenthal 1991; Middlebrook and Rico 1986; Palmer 2006; Pastor 2001: Schoultz 1998; Smith 2000; Teixeira 2012; Tulchin 2016). During the Cold War and its aftermath the degree of US influence varies considerably (Brands 2010) with it increasing after the Helsinki Accords and, most notably, after the fall of the USSR. Yet these ebbs and flows do not correlate with the presence of third party intervention (see figures 3 and 4). Interventions also tended to produce negative outcomes. At different points in time, Washington tried to push for the settlement of the Malvinas/Falklands (Norden and Russell 2002: 27; Escudé and Cisneros 2000: 135), Antofagasta (Sater 1990: 73), Belize (Handy 1984: 154), and Essequibo (Erwel 1996: 254; Romero and Kelly 2002: 109-111) disputes, but this involvement failed to lead to settlement. Moreover, when US tried to intervene more forcibly, resistant disputes tended to harden because one of the parties became suspicious US involvement would harm its position. In general Washington seems aware of this and prefers not to intervene as a third party, not even when asked to do so.

## 1.3. US Preferences against Militarization

The main reason why the US is implausibly driving the convergence of our three factors of interest is Washington's invariable opposition to militarization in the hemisphere. The aim to prevent militarization and escalation was the most consistent feature of Washington's policy towards the hemisphere post-1945. Embassy cables often record every incident of this type with dramatic detail. Even if the US might have supported democratization effectively in many cases and did provided assistance as a third party in particular contexts, we fail to identify instances of militarization in the hemisphere that were supported by Washington. The only exceptions regard cases in

which the US was directly involved – e.g. interventions such as in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Panama, and Haiti – or indirectly involved – e.g., in the Central American crises. In most of these cases the MID was not caused by nor related to a territorial dispute. Thus, the US could explain settlement failure through deterring militarization – all the white boxes in our crossword diagram – but not success – black boxes, i.e. the phenomenon we are interested in. This leads to one alternative question: Did the US *prevent* the settlement of resistant cases by preventing militarization? Those who have entertained this particular puzzle find that MID occurrence in Latin America is far more common than this hypothesis suggests (Mares 2001) and American influence fails to predict the phenomenon (see also Kacowicz 2005; Martin 2006).

### 2. Success

Now we turn to our cases of successful resistant case settlement: River Plate, Beagle, Oriente, Cordillera del Cóndor, and Bolsones-Fonseca. If the hypothesis that the US is driving the process is to perform reasonably, we should evidence an important deal of American involvement causing democratization, third party intervention, and militarization in these cases, or directly causing settlement independent of our proposed causal mechanism.

### 2.1. US and Democratization Preceding Settlement

The settlement of the River Plate dispute was possible thanks to the change in preferences brought about by Argentine democratization in 1973, yet the US was supporting authoritarianisms at the time. This is evident in CIA's involvement in the 1973 coup against the government of Salvador Allende in Chile (Jensen 1989; Valenzuela 1978) as well as support for the coup of Bordaberry in Uruguay during the same year (Kauffman 1979: 11; Leighton and Lopez 2015: xv; Gillespie 1984), which reached to high level officials such as Kissinger and Nixon himself. Thus, US influence worked in the inverse direction as expected. During the Beagle settlement (another episode of Argentine democratization) the US had changed to a more consistently prodemocratic policy. Washington did support Argentine elections in 1983. Unlike in other Latin American cases, however, the process seems to have been domestically driven with the US playing a very secondary role (Russell 1987: 43-44; Escudé and Cisneros 2000). Similar inconsistencies with this argument arise if one inspects the juncture of the Oriente-Mainas settlement. In the same five year period, Washington failed to condemn Colonel Odría's coup in Peru (1948) and thus cannot be seen as a prodemocratic actor (McClintock and Vallas 2003: 10; Clayton 1999: 175; see also Carey 1964).

Only in the junctures of the Bolsones-Fonseca and Cordillera del Cóndor settlements can US influence be seen as decisive in the way to democratization. In Honduras (Binns 2000: 53; Carothers 1991: 51) as in El Salvador (Arnson 1993: 158; Bosch 1999: 69-72; Karl 1986; Mainwaring and Pérez-Liñán 2013: 186; McClintock 1985; Sikkink 2004: 170-173) moderates in Washington played a central role in generating some convergence toward centrist forces in those countries, which eventually succeeded in the elections of 1982 and 1984, respectively. Support was far from straightforward, however, with the US also supporting the training of military and paramilitary forces in both countries, and providing enormous amounts of military aid to dictators. The Cordillera del Cóndor, might be the only of our five cases of success in which settlement coincides with the success of US pro-democratic pressures that brought Peru back to the democratic track (Kenney 2004; Palmer 1996: 223). Still, other authors might argue that the OAS and not the US played the key role in that process (Pevehouse 2005: 133).

2.2. US as a Third Party in Successful Settlements

The case for influential US third party intervention in successful cases is similarly difficult to make. In fact, the contrary seems to be true, with Washington trying not to play a relevant role as a facilitator in the resolution of these disputes. The US played no role whatsoever in the settlement of the River Plate dispute. In the case of the Beagle, Bolsones-Fonseca, Oriente-Mainas, and Cordillera del Cóndor, the US was clearly interested in deterring escalation and bringing about a resolution, yet it always played a secondary role and tried to have a different actor assume protagonism. As noted above in Appendix C, Zbigniew Brzezinski, who had a close relation with Pope John Paul II, facilitated the timely involvement of the Holy See that led Argentina and Chile to the negotiating table (Villar 2016: 98-102). In the Central American crises, the US progressively lost a role as a possible facilitator to the members of the Contadora Group – then the Rio Group – formed by Latin American states (Wehr and Lederach 1991). In both Peru-Ecuador disputes, Roosevelt and then Clinton tried to avoid getting directly involved (St John 1999: 43; Wood 1966: 338; Wood 1978: 147) relying on the good offices of Brazil and the other guarantors of the Rio Protocol. In all these cases Washington seems to be trying to avoid being seen as interfering in other countries' sovereign affairs.

### 2.3. US and Militarization in Successful Settlements

In the MIDs that preceded our five resistant case settlements Washington seems to be in complete opposition to militarization. In fact, in all the cases the US seems clearly alarmed by the events and mobilizes its diplomacy in one way or another to prevent escalation. Thus, although the MIDs clearly capture the attention of Washington, it seems unlikely that they are caused by the US in even the most indirect fashion.

### **Appendices References**

- Acevedo, Domingo E. and Claudio Grossman. 1996. "The Organization of the American States and the Protection of Democracy." In *Beyond Sovereignty: Collectively Defending Democracy in the Americas*, ed. Tom Farer. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 132-149.
- Alles, Santiago. 2011. "De la Crisis del Beagle al Acta de Montevideo de 1979: el Establecimiento de la Mediación en un Juego de Dos Niveles." *Estudios Internacionales* 44 (169): 79-117.
- Allock, John B., Guy Arnold, Alan J. Day, D. S. Lewis, Lorimer Poultney, Roland Rance, and D. J. Sagar. 1992. *Border and Territorial Disputes*. Farmington Hills: Gale Group.
- Arnson, Cynthia. 1982. *El Salvador: A Revolution Confronts the United States*. Washington DC: Institute for Policy Studies.
- Arnson, Cynthia. 1993. Crossroads: Congress, the President, and Central America, 1976-1993. University Park: Penn State University Press.
- Arquilla, John, and María Moyano Rasmussen. 2001. "The Origins of the South Atlantic War." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 33 (4): 739-775.
- Atkins, Pope. 1999. Latin America and the Caribbean in the International System, Boulder: Westview Press.
- Bertucci, Mariano. 2013. "Scholarly Research on U.S.-Latin American Relations: Where Does the Field Stand?" *Latin American Politics and Society* 55 (4): 119-142.
- Bethell, Leslie and Ian Roxborough. 1992. *Latin America between the Second World War and the Cold War, 1944-1948*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Binns, Jack R. 2000. *The United States in Honduras 1980-1981*, New York: McFarland and Company.
- Biswas, Asit. 2013. *Managing Transboundary Waters of Latin America*. London: Routledge.
- Blasier, Cole. 1976. *The Hovering Giant: U.S. Responses to Revolutionary Change in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.
- Bosch, Brian J. 1999. *The Salvadoran Officer Corp and the Final Offensive of 1981*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co.
- Brands, Hal. 2010. *Latin America's Cold War: An International History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Caetano, Gerardo and Jose P. Rilla. 1998. *Breve Historia de la Dictadura: 1973-1985*. Montevideo: Centro Latinoamericano de Economía Humana.
- Carey, James C. 1964. *Perú and the United States 1900-1962*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Carothers, Thomas. 1991. In the Name of Democracy: U.S. Policy Toward Latin America, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chirinos Soto, Enrique. 1962. El Perú Frente a Junio de 1962. Lima: Ediciones del Sol.
- Clayton, Lawrence. 1999. *Peru and the United States: The Condor and the Eagle.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Cottam, Martha. .1994. *Images and Intervention: US Policies in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Crandall, Russell. 2016. The Salvador Option. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cronqvist, Lasse, and Dirk Berg-Schlosser. 2009. "Multi-Value QCA (mvQCA)." In *Configurational Comparative Methods*, eds. Benoit Rihoux and Charles Ragin. London: Sage, 69-86.
- Darnton, Christopher. 2013. "After Decentering: The Politics of Agency and Hegemony in Hemispheric Relations." *Latin American Research Review* 48 (3): 231-39.

- Del Castillo, Lilian. 2008. *The Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front Legal Regime*. Boston: Nijhoff Publishers.
- Dobson, Alan and Steve Marsh. 2006. US Foreign Policy since 1945. New York: Routledge.
- Dozer, Marquand. 1959. Are We Good Neighbors? Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Escudé, Carlos. 1991. "Argentina: The Costs of Contradiction." In *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America, Case Studies*, ed. Abraham Lowenthal. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 3-38.
- Escudé, Carlos, and Andrés Cisneros, eds. 2000. *Historia General de las Relaciones Exteriores de la República Argentina* 13. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano.
- Euraque, Darío. 1996. *Reinterpreting the Banana Republic*. Chapell Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Ewell, Judith. 1996. Venezuela and the United States: From Monroe's Hemisphere to Petroleum's Empire. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Fazal, Tanisha. 2007. State Death: The Politics and Geography of Conquest, Occupation, and Annexation. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Frederick, Bryan A., Paul R. Hensel, and Christopher Macaulay. 2017. "The Issue Correlates of War Territorial Claims Data, 1816–2001." *Journal of Peace Research*, Published online first: <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343316676311</u>
- Francis, Michael J. 1977. *The Limits of Hegemony*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Garrett, James. 1985. "The Beagle Channel Dispute: Confrontation and Negotiation in the Southern Cone." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 27 (3): 81-109.
- Gibler, Douglas M., and Andrew P. Owsiak. 2017. "Democracy and the Settlement of International Borders, 1919-2000." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, forthcoming.
- Gillespie, Charles. 1984. "The Breakdown of Democracy in Uruguay: Alternative Political Models" Latin American Program The Wilson Center, *Working Papers* 143.
- Gillespie, Charles. 1991. Negotiating Democracy: Politicians and Generals in Uruguay, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabendorff, Wolf. 1982. "De País Aislado a Aliado Preferido? Las Relaciones entre Argentina y los Estados Unidos." *Estudios Internacionales*, 15 (58): 232-39.
- Handelman, Howard and Thomas Griffin Sanders. 1981. *Military Government and the Movement Toward Democracy in South America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Handy, Jim. 1984. Gift of the Devil: A History of Guatemala. Boston: South End Press.
- Hensel, Paul R., Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers, and Clayton L. Thyne. 2008. "Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52 (1): 117-143.
- Herz, Monica, and Joao Nogueira. 2002. Ecuador vs Peru: Peacemaking Amid Rivalry, London: Lynne Rienner.
- Hey, Jeanne A. 1995. "Ecuadoran Foreign Policy Since 1979: Ideological Cycles or a Trend towards Neoliberalism?" *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 37 (4): 57-88.
- Huth, Paul, Sarah Croco, and Benjamin Appel. 2013. "Bringing Law to the Table: Legal Claims, Focal Points, and the Settlement of Territorial Disputes since 1945." *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (1): 90-103.

- Ishmael, Odeen. 2013. *The Trail of Diplomacy: The Guyana-Venezuela Border Issue*. Bloomington: XLibris.
- Jensen, Poul. 1989. *The Garotte: The United States and Chile, 1970-1973*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Kacowicz, Arie. 2005. The Impact of Norms in International Society: The Latin American Experience 1881-2001. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Karl, Terry L. 1986. "Imposing Consent? Electoralism versus Democratization in El Salvador." In *Elections and Democratization in Latin America*, eds. Drake, Paul W. and Edwardo Silva, San Diego: Center for Iberian and Latin American Studies, 9-36.
- Kaufman, Edy. 1979. *Uruguay in Transition: From Civilian to Military Rule*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Kenney, Charles D. 2004. Fujimori's Coup and the Breakdown of Democracy in Latin America, Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Kenworthy, Eldon. 1995. *America/Américas: Myth in the Making of US Foreign Policy Toward Latin America*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Krieg, William L. 1986. *Ecuadorean-Peruvian Rivalry in the Upper Amazon*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.
- Kryzanek, Michael. 1990. US-Latin American Relations, New York: Praeger.
- Lake, David. 2009. *Hierarchy in International Relations*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Langley, Lester D. 1980. *The United States and the Caribbean 1900-1970*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Lauterpacht, Elihu, and Christopher J. Greenwood. 1994. "Case Concerning the Land, Island, and Maritime Frontier Dispute (El Salvador/Honduras)." *International Law Reports*, 97. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lecaro Bustamante, Arturo. 1997. *El Problema Territorial con el Perú desde la Perspectiva Diplomática*. Quito: Artes Gráficas Señal Impreseñal Cía Ltda.
- Legler, Thomas, Sharon Lean, and Dexter Boniface, eds. 2007. *Promoting Democracy in the Americas*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lehman, Kenneth D. 1999. *Bolivia and the United States: A Limited Partnership.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Lehoucq, Edouard. 1991. "Class Conflict, Political Crisis and the Breakdown of Democratic Practices in Costa Rica." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 23 (1): 37– 60
- Leighton Pablo and Fernando López. 2015. 40 Years are Nothing: History and Memory of the 1973 Coup D'Etat in Uruguay. New York: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- LeoGrande, William. 1998. Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Leonard, Thomas, Jurgen Buchenau, Kyle Longley, Mount S. Graeme. 2012. *Encyclopedia of US-Latin American Relations*, New York: Sage Publishing.
- Levine, Daniel. 1973. *Conflict and Political Change in Venezuela*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Lieuwen, Edwin. 1965. US Policy in Latin America. New York: Praeger.
- Long, Tom. 2015. *Latin America confronts the United States: asymmetry and influence*. New york: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, Abraham. 1991. *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mainwarring, Scott, and Aníbal Pérez Liñán. 2013. *Democracies and Dictatorships in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mares, David. 2001. *Violent Peace: Militarized Interstate Bargaining in Latin America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Martin, Felix. 2006. *Militarist Peace in South America: Conditions for War and Peace*. New York: Palgrave
- McClintock, Cynthia and Fabian Vallas. 2003. *The United States and Peru: Cooperation at a Cost*, London: Routledge.
- McClintock, Michael. 1985. *The American Connection: State Terror and Popular Resistance in El Salvador*. London: Zed Books.
- McElveen, James and James Siekmeier. 2014. Foreign Relations of the. United States, 1969–1976. Volume XXI. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Middlebrook, Kevin and Carlos Rico. 1986. *The United States and Latin America in the 1980s*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Miller, Aragorn Storm. 2016. *Precarious Paths to Freedom: The United States, Venezuela, and the Latin American Cold War*. Wilmington: University of North Carolina Press.
- Muñoz, Heraldo. 1991. "Chile: The Limits of Success." In *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America, Case Studies*, ed. Abraham Lowenthal. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 39-52.
- Needler, Martin. 1964. *Anatomy of a Coup D'Etat*, Washington DC: Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems.
- Norden, Deborah and Roberto Russell. 2002. *The United States and Argentina: Changing Relations in a Changing World*, London: Routledge.
- O'Brien, Thomas. 2009. "Interventions, Conventional and Unconventional: Current Scholarship on Inter-American Relations," *Latin American Research Review* 44 (1): 257-265.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Orellana Portillo, Gustavo. 2012. Antecedentes y Análisis del 'Acuerdo Especial entre Guatemala y Belice para Someter el Reclamo Territorial, Insular y Maritimo' a la Corte Internacional de Justicia. Guatemala City: Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores.
- Owsiak, Andrew P., Allison K. Cuttner, and Brent Buck. 2016. "The International Border Agreements Dataset." *Conflict Management and Peace Science,* forthcoming.
- Palmer, David Scott. 1996. "Fujipopulism and Peru's Progress," *Current History* 95: 70-75.
- Palmer, David Scott. 2006. US Relations with Latin America During the Clinton Years, Miami: University Press of Florida.
- Palmer, David Scott. 1997. "Peru-Ecuador Border Conflict: Missed Opportunities, Misplaced Nationalism, and Multilateral Peacekeeping." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 39 (3): 109-148.
- Palmer, David Scott. 1999. "The Search for Conflict Resolution: the Guarantors and the Peace Process in the Ecuador-Peru Dispute." In Security Cooperation in the Americas, edited by Richard Downes and Gabriel Marcella. Miami: North-South Center Press.
- Pastor, Robert. 1991. *Whirlpool: US Foreign Policy Toward Latin America and the Caribbean*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pastor, Robert. 2001. Exiting the Whirlpool: U.S. foreign policy towards Latin America and the Caribbean, Boulder, Westview Press.

- Payne, Arnold. 1968. *The Peruvian Coup D'Etat of 1962*, Washington DC: Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems.
- Pevehouse, Jon. 2005. *Democracy from Above: Regional Organizations and Democratization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Phil Gunson, Greg, and Andrew Thompson. 1991. *The Dictionary of Contemporary Politics of Central America and the Caribbean*. London: Routledge.
- Pike, Fredrick. 1995. FDR's Good Neighbor Policy. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Pike, Fredrik. 1967. The Modern History of Peru. New York: Praeger.
- Pineo, Ronn. 2007. *Ecuador and the United States: Useful Strangers*, Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Potash, Robert, A. 1996. *The Army and Politics in Argentina, 1962-1973: From Frondizi's Fall to thePeronist Restauration*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Princen, Thomas. 1992. Intermediaries in International Conflict. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rabe, Stephen G. 1988. *Eisenhower and Latin America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Rabe, Stephen G. 1999. *The Most Dangerous Area in the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America*, Chapell Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rabe, Stephen G. 2011. *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Randall, Stephen. 1992. Colombia and the United States: Hegemony and Interdependence, Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Rappoport, Mario and Claudio Spiguel. 2009. *Relaciones Tumultuosas: Estados Unidos y el primer peronismo*, Buenos Aires: Emecé.
- Robinson, William. 2000. "Promoting Capitalist Polyarchy: The Case of Latin America." In American Democratic Promotion: Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts, eds. Cox, Michael, John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi. New York: Oxford University Press, 308-324.
- Romero, Carlos and Janet Kelly. 2002. *United States and Venezuela: Rethinking a Relationship*. London: Routledge.
- Rouquié, Alain, and Michel Vale. 1973. "Honduras-El Salvador, The War of the One Hundred Hours: A Case of Latin American 'Desintegration'." *International Journal of Politics* 3 (3): 17-51.
- Russell, Roberto. 1987. "Las relaciones Argentina-Estados Unidos: del 'alineamiento heterodoxo' a la 'recomposición madura'," In *Continuidad y cambio en las relaciones América Latina/Estados Unidos*, ed. Mónica Hirst, Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano, 24-45.
- Russell, Roberto. 1990. "El Proceso de Toma de Decisiones en la Política Exterior Argentina (1976–1984)." In *Política Exterior y Toma de Decisiones en América Latina*, ed. Roberto Russell. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano.
- Sater, William. 1990. *Chile and the United States: Empires in Conflict*, Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Schenoni, Luis and Scott Mainwaring. *Forthcoming*. "Hegemonic Effects and Regime Change in Latin America." V-Dem Conference, University of Notre Dame,
- Schlesinger, Stephen, and Stephen Kinzer. 1982. *Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Schoultz, Lars. 1998. Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Schoultz, Lars. 2002. "Evolving Concepts of Intervention: Promoting Democracy" in *The Globalization of U.S.-Latin American Relations*, edited by V. Bouvier, London: Praeger.
- Schwartzberg, Steven. 2003. *Democracy and US Policy in Latin America during the Truman Years*. Gainsville, FL: University of Florida Press.
- Selser, Gregorio. 1970. La CIA en Bolivia. La Paz: Hernandez Editor.
- Sharp, Daniel. 1972. US Foreign Policy and Peru. Austin: Universoty of Texas Press.
- Sikkink, Katherine. 2004. Mixed Signals: U.S. Human Rights Policy Toward Latin America. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Smith, Peter. 2000. *Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S.- Latin American Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Tony. 1991. "The Alliance for Progress: The 1960s." Lowenthal Abraham (ed.) Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America, Themes and Issues, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 71-89.
- Smith, Tony. 1994. America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- St John, R. Bruce. 1994. "Stalemate in Atacama." IBRU Bulletin, 2 (1): 64-68.
- St John, R. Bruce. 1999. "The Ecuador-Peru Boundary Dispute" *IBRU Bulletin*, 3 (1): 1-62.
- St. John, R. Bruce. 1992. *The Foreign Policy of Peru*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Stanley, William. 1996. *The Protection Racket State: Elite Politics, Military Extortion, and Civil War in El Salvador*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Stinnett, Douglas M., Jaroslav Tir, Philip Schafer, Paul F. Diehl, and Charles Gochman. 2002. "The Correlates of War Project Direct Contiguity Data, Version 3." Conflict Management and Peace Science 19(2):58-66.
- Streeter, Stephen M. 2000. *Managing the Counterreviolution: The United States and Guatemala 1954-1961*, Athens: Center for International Studies University of Georgia.
- Taylor, Clark. 1998. *Return of Guatemala's Refugees*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Teixeira, Carlos. 2012. Brazil, the United States, and the South American Subsystem : Regional Politics and the Absent Empire, Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Thyne, Clayton. 2010. "Supporter of Stability or Agent of Agitation? The Effect of US Foreign Policy on Coups in Latin America." *Journal of Peace Research* 47 (4): 449-461.
- Tobar Donoso, Julio, and Alfredo Luna Tobar. 1994. *Derecho Territorial Ecuadoriano,* 4th ed. Quito: Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores.
- Tulchin, Joseph S., and Knut Walter. 1991. "Nicaragua: The Limits of Intervention." In Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America, Case Studies, ed. Abraham Lowenthal, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 111-141.
- Tulchin, Joseph S. 1987. "La Guerra de las Malvinas: un Conflicto Inevitable que Nunca Debió Haber Ocurrido." *Estudios Internacionales* 20 (78): 192-209.
- Tulchin, Joseph. S. 1988. "The United States and Latin America in the 1960s." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 30 (1): 1-36.
- Valenzuela, Arturo. 1978. "The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Chile." In *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes*, eds. Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Villar, Andres. 2016. *Autonomy and Negotiation in Foreign Policy: The Beagle Channel Crisis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Wehr, Paul, and John Paul Lederach. 1991. "Mediating Conflict in Central America." Journal of Peace Research 28 (1): 85-98.
- Whitehead, Lawrence. 1981. "Bolivia's Failed Democratization of 1977-1980,"
  *Working Papers of the Latin American Program* 100, Washington DC, The Wilson Center.
- Whitehead, Lawrence. 1986. "International Aspects of Democratization." In *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy, Part III*, eds. Guillermo O'Donnell, and Philippe Schmitter, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 3-46.
- Whitehead, Lawrence. 1991. "Bolivia since 1930." In *The Cambridge History of Latin America* 8, ed. Leslie Bethell, New York: Cambridge University Press, 509-584.
- Whitehead, Lawrence. 1996. *The International Dimension of Democratization*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wiarda, Howard. 1986. "Can Democracy be Exported?" In *The United States and Latin American in the 1980's*, eds. Kevin Middlebrook, and Carlos Rico. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 325-351.
- Wood, Bryce. 1985. *The Dismantling of the Good Neighbor Policy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Wood, Bryce. 1966. *The United States and Latin American Wars, 1932-1942.* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wood, Bryce. 1978. *Aggression and History: The Case of Ecuador and Peru*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Zamora, Rubén. 2003. *La izquierda partidaria salvadoreña: Entre la identidad y el poder*, San Salvador: FLACSO.