

## Chapter 7

### Conflict Management in Global Politics

#### Responding to the International Security Agenda

- Chapter 7 evaluates instruments and tools of conflict management
  - Direct and indirect diplomatic interaction
  - Arms control and disarmament
  - Concept of human security
  - Use of international organizations and law
  - Peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention
  - Sanctions
- Conflict management like international security is always changing

#### The Nature of Diplomacy

- Diplomacy can be defined as purposeful communication between states, but is widening to include a variety of activities in contemporary foreign policy
  - Includes diplomatic activity between states and groups and nonstate actors, as well as individuals who may not be in formal positions of political power in a state apparatus
- Fundamental components of diplomatic activity
  - The concepts of representation and communication
- Reps. of states are acting on behalf of the government of that state, as well as in the instruction of the government
- Communication protocols allow for interaction using mutually acceptable procedures
- Diplomacy also helps efforts to prevent, contain, and manage international conflict
  - On the other hand diplomacy can be aggressive and militaristic
- Public and private diplomatic affairs are highly formalized events
  - When head of state makes a visit – extremely elaborate
- Many trappings of diplomacy discarded – key traditions still linger, like diplomatic immunity
- Extraterritoriality is a foundation of diplomatic tradition
- Diplomatic protocol prevents individuals, groups, and states from clashing on issues of symbolism and reputation
- Diplomatic protocol maintains image that diplomats, officials, and leaders of equivalent rank are treated as equals
- Miscommunication occurs often in global politics
- Personalities are often a crucial influence of affairs of state
- Diplomacy went through significant changes in latter half of 20<sup>th</sup> century
- Decolonization and increased global interdependence forced diplomatic services to adjust to wider variety of language and culture and larger number of states
- Increased number of states has increased relevance of multilateral and conference diplomacy – within and outside established institutions
- More efficient if all the states are represented around a single table

- There is more of a need to know more specific technical knowledge
  - Traditional diplomatic service lacks this knowledge
- Global communications have made contact between governments instantaneous
- Another change is the expanding role of nonstate actors
- Governments now maintain an active link to a wide variety of groups
- Increasing the contact between different levels of society between two or more states is sometimes called *track-two diplomacy*
- Foreign policy remains a relatively closed area of government activity
- Open availability of information about international events – heightened relevance of public opinion
  - Made diplomacy a more public affairs – this has implications
    - Opinions of professional career diplomats reject if no public support exists
    - However, public opinion may compel leaders to act in ways that are contrary to the advice of the diplomatic service
  - Conclusion – public opinion may cause diplomacy of a state or group to be more reflective of the body of people; however it may lead to rash or dangerous diplomacy designed primarily to capture votes
- Increasing importance attached to summit diplomacy, the formal meeting of heads of state and government
- Summit diplomacy supporters
  - Can enable leaders to establish personal relationship
  - Can remove frustrating constraints of slow diplomatic process
  - Ex. Camp David brought together two countries that had fought for 30 years
- Summit diplomacy detractors
  - Can lead to ill-advised decisions made by leaders without adequate consultation with experts or time for reflection
  - Ex. Yalta Conference
  - Many claim they are just photo shoots and parties, sometimes with little progress
  - Attract large protest gatherings

### **Diplomatic Techniques and Conflict Management**

- Effectiveness of diplomacy as conflict management tools depends on whether a set of proposals can be developed that each party prefers over reaching no agreement at all or over using violence to settle dispute
- When outcome is not acceptable to all sides, diplomacy will fail as means of preventing, controlling, or managing conflict
- Irony – during war crisis periods when diplomatic communication is valuable, such communication is least frequent
- Diplomatic techniques that have been employed to facilitate conflict management
  - Signaling
  - Bargaining and Negotiation
    - Useful tactics
      - Discourage zero-sum views of the issues
      - Establish a fair compromise to ensure a lasting settlement

- Avoid ultimatums and posturing; encourage dialogue and debate
- Avoid humiliating one's opponents
- Blend rewards and threats
- Avoid personal *ad hominem* attacks on the other party
- Look for solutions acceptable to both sides, but different from the positions taken at the beginning of negotiations
- Look for nonspecific compensation, one side gets what it wants but gives up something that was not part of the original dispute or discussion
- Divide the issue into separate and more manageable subjects for agreement
- Third-Party Mediation
  - Third Parties can provide services such as
  - Providing good offices
  - Providing a neutral site for negotiations
  - Clarifying facts and evidence
  - Acting as a mediator by becoming active in negotiations, making suggestions, and breaking down deadlocks
  - Acting as an arbitrator with the consent of the parties
  - Acting as an adjudicator

### **Diplomacy as a Conflict Management Instrument**

- Failures of diplomatic conflict management
  - Weeks before the outbreak of World War One
- Successful cases of diplomatic conflict management'
  - 1987 Costa Rican President designed peace accord for Central America
- Two of the most watched diplomatic conflict management efforts today are Middle East peace process and the Northern Ireland peace process

### **Diplomacy and Conflict Management in the Middle East**

- Since 1940 main component is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict
- A root of conflict is land, both claim the same territory
- Efforts have been concentrated on control of land, Palestinian self-rule, control of Jerusalem, return of Palestinian refugees to their homes in Israel, Israeli settlements on West Bank, economic opportunity for Palestinians, access to water
- Conflict resisted all diplomatic management – Palestine Liberation Organization and government of Israel using acts of terror, military, civil disturbance
- Breakthrough occurred in September 1993
  - Israeli and PLO officials were secretly meeting in Oslo Norway
  - Mediation of Norwegian government
- Agreement reached on September 13, 1993
  - Israel recognized PLO as rightful representative of Palestinian people
  - PLO recognized Israel's right to exist and abandoned terrorism
  - Israeli withdrawal from Gaza Strip and West Bank
  - Self-rule for Palestinians in above territories
- Follow-up Interim Agreement signed in 1995

- Phased transfer of some land to Palestinian control
- Phased withdrawal of Israeli forces from above areas
- Easier movement for Palestinians between Gaza and West Bank
- Greater freedom for the Palestinian economy (heavily dependant on Israel)
- In return PLO agreed to prevent further terrorist attacks on Israel
- Disputes on outstanding issues began to erode support for agreement on both sides
- Additional progress
  - Agreement to divide the city of Hebron – reached in 1997
  - Both sides renewed commitment to peace in Wye River Memorandum in 1998
- Continued development of Israeli settlements in West Bank caused anxiety among Palestinians – and renewed terrorist attacks
- July 10, 2000 – mediation with Bill Clinton in effort to break deadlock – talks stopped on 25<sup>th</sup> over disagreement about future of Jerusalem
- Both sides began preparing for renewal of violence
- Some Palestinian leaders called for uprising to force Israel to agree to a separate Palestinian state
- Israeli Defense Force prepared to crush any Palestinian uprising
- “Spark” came when Ariel Sharon visited the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif, holy site for both Muslims and Jews in fall of 2000
- Neither side showed restraint
- El-Aqsa Intifada launched September 2000
- IDF responded with massive campaign to suppress Palestinian uprising
- Sharon elected prime minister on February 6 2001
- Raids, suicide bombing etc. increased
- 300 P and 38 I dead
- Bush called for end of Israeli settlements in West band, end of Palestinian attacks, creation of Palestinian state
- February 2002 – Saudi Arabia proposed “grand bargain”- called for Israeli withdrawal to pre-1967 boundaries – exchange for normalization of relations with all Arab states
- Weak version of proposal accepted at an Arab Summit in Beirut in March 2002
- U.S. supported – Israel less enthusiastic because it called for Palestinian capital in East Jerusalem and supported El-Aqsa Intifada
- Violence continued through 2002 and 2003
- Reassertion of Israeli control meant by early 2003 boundaries outlined in Oslo Agreements were almost eliminated
- Early 2002 Israel began construction of a “security fence” – designed to close off border between Israel and West Bank
- April 2003 another peace plan proposed known as the “Road Map”
  - Designed and supported by U.S., Russia, the EU, the UN
  - Called for complete settlement of dispute by 2005
  - Ceasefire would be established
  - Palestinian Authority would carry out reforms
  - Israel would dismantle illegal settlements set up since 2001

- Palestinian state would be created
- Negotiations would be conducted on final borders, status of Jerusalem, right of return for Palestinian refugees
- The “road map” did not achieve much
- Domestic politics of Israel and Palestinian Authority increasingly defined
- Israeli has varying attitudes toward any peace process
  - Many support return to peace process, but small conservative parties show little interest in compromise
- In Palestinian Authority support for Yasser Arafat fallen
  - Militant groups have more popular support from Palestinian people
  - Little or no control over more radical Palestinian groups
- Future political settlements will have to include Palestinian Authority AND other more radical Palestinian groups who direct suicide-bombing campaigns
- Israeli government pursued a policy of economic and physical isolation of West Bank and Gaza – causing economic state for Palestinians to worsen
- 2000-2002 60% of the Palestinian population was living in poverty
- More than half this population was dependant on food aid and demolished homes exceeded 2500 by mid-2003

### **Diplomacy and Conflict Management in Northern Ireland**

- Origins in Protestant English conquest of Catholic Ireland in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century
- Has become a conflict involving nationality, sovereignty, and self-determination
- English dominance in Ireland secured by William of Orange at battle of the Boyne in 1690
- Irish Civil War (1919-1921)
  - Between British and the Irish Republican Army
  - Ended in truce and independence of Southern Ireland in 1922
- Post ICW – violence in the North continued between Catholic Nationalists or Republicans (wanted six counties of Northern Ireland united with South) and Protestant Loyalists or Unionists (wanted Northern Ireland to remain under British rule)
- 1922-1969 – calm
- violence returned in the modern “time of troubles” more than 32000 killed
- “Bloody Sunday” 1972 – unarmed protestors in Londonderry shot
  - after this the British army was regarded as an occupying force by Catholics
- Bombings and shootings by IRA continued through early 1990s
- Northern Ireland wanted a peace settlement
- Round of peace talks began in 1996 – mediation of U.S. Senator George Mitchell
  - After IRA announced ceasefire in 1997 all major parties were present
  - Diplomatic breakthrough occurred on April 10, 1998
- Settlement called the Belfast Agreement or Good Friday Agreement
  - Northern Ireland would remain a part of Great Britain as long as majority of people wanted it
  - Assembly would be established in Northern Ireland for self-governance

- Institutions would be established to develop more cooperation between Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland
  - Civil rights of Catholics would be established and protected
- Elections held for new assembly in June
- Bombing, assassinations, attacks on property continued
- Tensions rose during “Orange Marches” commemorate the Battle of the Boyne
- 1999 execution of Good Friday Agreement stalled – British government suspended the new assembly when the IRA refused to disarm
- Attempts to revitalize agreement in 2000 and 2001 were not very successful
- Both sides accused other of noncompliance with the agreement
- In wake of 9/11 IRA was under pressure to meet commitments to decommission its weapons and disarm
  - Opportunity lost amidst revelations that IRA was spying on government
- Slow pace of IRA to disarm and spying scandal led to suspension of political institutions
- In effort to save peace process British and Irish governments issued joint declarations in October 2003
  - Calling all sides to restore momentum behind Good Friday Agreement
- Early 2004 peace process remained stalled, political institutions of Northern Ireland function poorly, and decommissioning of weapons is still slower than expected
- Large-scale violence resumed – still possible for both sides to not renew commitment to peace process
  
- For conflict management to be successful both sides must prefer negotiated settlement to other alternatives (war or no settlement)
- Even if there is commitment from all parties they may have difficulty controlling their people in order to implement the negotiation
- Results from diplomatic management efforts
  - Improved climate between the parties to a dispute
  - Establishment of a basis for further negotiation
  - Creation of short-term agreement to settle an immediate problem
  - Establishment of a firm basis for a lasting peace
- Results can include creation of agreement that becomes a point of dissatisfaction or a breakdown in negotiations and collapse of diplomatic efforts
- Without diplomatic conflict management recourse to armed struggle is often the consequence

### **Disarmament and Arms Control**

- Main assumption is weapons contribute to outbreak of war along with a view that peace can be attained only through balances of power or preparation for war
- Supporters of disarmament say frequency or war can be reduced by
  - Eliminating threatening or destabilizing weapons
  - Preventing arms races that increase tension and absorb financial resources
  - Promoting mutual trust and confidence
  - Limiting the destructiveness of war if it does occur

- World War 1 – the destructiveness led to several arms control efforts
- After World War 2 – development of nuclear weapons and arms race between superpowers – something needs to be done to control development/production
  - Peace movement organizations
  - Sponsored rallies
  - Marches
  - Concerts dedicated to ending the arms race
- Non-state actors in a previously state-dominated game
- Disarmament – drastically reduce or eliminate all weapons in step toward elimination of war
- Arms control – regulating the growth of weapons and sometimes reducing arms levels (reduction in risk of war) – done through
  - Efforts to stabilize status quo
  - Build confidence between states and groups
  - Encourage the peaceful resolution of disputes
  - Discourage the use of force
- “Arms control is fundamentally conservative enterprise. Disarmament seeks to overturn the status quo; arms control works to perpetuate it.”
- Examples of disarmament efforts
  - Sixth-century B.C.E. China – states formed disarmament league – contributed to century of peace
  - 1817 Great Britain and U.S. signed the Rush-Bagot Treaty
  - End of World War 1 – Woodrow Wilson called for national disarmament to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety
  - League of Nations sponsored a World Disarmament Conference in 1932
  - UN has held a number of special sessions on disarmament since beginning in 1945
- Other examples are force measures of unintentional
- Disarmament has short historical record – new trends towards disarmament may be developing
- Large historical record of arms control
- Majority of cases – has tried to ban production or deployment of specific weapon or restrict number of weapons a party is allowed to possess
- During the Cold War there were two types of arms control
  - Bilateral agreements established by the two superpowers
  - Multilateral arms control agreements involving other countries
  - Some covered specific territory or region others had system-wide scope
- Many agreements survive as foundation of contemporary efforts to address transnational security issues

### **Bilateral Arms Control after the Cold War**

- Cover issues that concern two states
- Easier to achieve because they are only concerned with one set of interests and differences
- Signing of arms control agreements accompanied by efforts to improve relationship between U.S. and Soviet Union in times of détente

- Some agreements are informal
- May 1992 three countries signed Lisbon Protocol to the START agreement
  - Eliminate all nuclear weapons on territories
  - Sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)
  - These 3 and South Africa only ones to dispossess nuclear weapons
- 1992 Bush and Yeltsin agreed to Joint Understanding under START agreement
  - reduce the nuclear arsenals of superpowers by 60% by 2003 (later 2007)
  - formally signed as START 2 Agreement in January 1993
  - eliminates multiple warheads on land-based ICBMs
  - restricts SLBM warheads to no more than 1750
  - eliminating the weapons that would be most useful in first strike
- End of Cold War reduced importance of bilateral arms control between U.S. and Russia – remain relevant for three reasons
  - Agreements between Russia and U.S. remain a sign of positive diplomatic relations, mutual trust, confidence
  - Securing Russia's nuclear warheads, fissile material, nuclear weapons infrastructure
  - Strategy to secure regional stability and build confidence and trust between countries with history of conflict and crises

### **Multilateral Arms Control During and After the Cold War**

- After Cold War, arms control shifted from control of nuclear arms race
- Focus of arms control is on transnational security
  - Requiring engagement and cooperation of many countries
- Mainly Cold War agreements being strengthened and adapted to new international conditions
- Interest renewed in multilateral agreements controlling spread of weapons
- Using multilateral arms control agreements to respond to the threat of weapons proliferation
- Two agreements to control spread of nuclear weapons
  - Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) signed July 1968 – nuclear weapon states are obligated not to transfer nuclear weapons or related technology, peaceful explosions permitted, participants pledge toward universal nuclear disarmament
  - Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) – verifies compliance with the NPT through constant monitoring of nuclear facilities and use of inspections
- Some non-nuclear weapons states have built significant weapons development programs
- 2003 IAEA discovered traces of uranium at nuclear facilities in Iran
  - later stated Iran did not live up to its treaty obligations
- April 2003 North Korea told U.S. officials it possessed a nuclear bomb
- These example brought charges of IAEA to be ineffective as verification and lacks sufficient resources and enforcement capacity
- NTP criticized for role in encouraging the spread of nuclear energy

- India argued that NPT makes states work for disarmament, but when they fail to do this it is unfair for them to criticize countries for developing nuclear arms when they didn't even sign the treaty, thus they are not even violating it
- NPT maintains norm that nuclear weapons are dangerous and should be avoided
- Without the NPT a bomb would be much easier to build
- CTBT has long history
  - Since 1950 periodic efforts made to ban all nuclear tests
  - Partial Test Ban Treaty signed 1963 by U.S., Britain, U.S.S.R – joined by France and China - did not include underground tests
  - CTBT signed on September 24, 1996 – 90+ countries committed to not test nuclear weapons
  - CTBT prohibits peaceful explosions – closing hole in NPT
  - India and Pakistan refused to sign
- Two mechanisms to address problem of bio and chem. weapons
- Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC)
  - Signed January 1993 – full force in 1997
  - Aimed at disarmament rather than arms control
  - Obligation to destroy all chemical weapons and facilities in 10 years
  - Required to state if they have weapons, facilities, if they have received or sold the weapons from another country
  - Countries can challenge other countries for verification of treaty
- Biological Weapons Convention (BWC)
  - Signed in 1972 – full force in 1975
  - Aimed at eliminating entire class of WMD
  - Prohibits development, production, stockpiling – but not their use
  - Lacks verification system and allows countries to use weapons for defensive purposes
- U.S. rejected proposed protocol for BWC – little progress since
- End-user certificate – accompanied any shipment of weapons
  - Specified country of final delivery and prohibited that country from diverting the weapons to another country
  - Subject to bribes, counterfeits, and smuggling
- Non-nuclear multilateral arms control efforts
  - Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE) – to reduce levels of conventional weapons in Europe maintain by NATO and Warsaw Pact
  - Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) – to control spread of ballistic missiles
  - UN Register of Conventional Arms – to establish an information service to track arms shipments around the world
- Inter-American Convention on Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions
  - Requires reporting of regional weapons sales and purchases

### **Critics of Arms Control**

- Very risky and dangerous – success depends on trusting opponents not to cheat

- Because opponents word can't be trusted – arms control compliance must be verified (complicated and difficult)
- Arms control agreements will be violated in times of crisis or war
- Knowledge to manufacture exists so they cannot be banned
- Weapons that are banned have little military utility – are not useful weapons
- Arms control agreements only challenge competitions into weapons-system types that are not banned or restricted
- Technological developments can cause arms control to be ineffective
- Making agreements with authoritarian governments is ill advised – more likely to cheat and be able to hide it
- Agreements only bind those who signed it
- Agreements often violated
  
- Governments continue to direct more resources to researching and developing new weapons than to control weapons
- Military and political leaders remain wary of disarmament and arms control as a means of strengthening their security
- Leaders are reluctant to engage in arms control either because they want to attain a certain military capability and aren't willing to commit to an agreement, or because they have superiority in a certain military capability and see no reason to accept constraints on it
- Arms control is not a matter of East and West but a matter between North and South – Southern governments viewing global efforts to prevent the spread of certain weapons as discriminatory actions by the rich
- More states are able to develop and manufacture weapons systems – making it hard to reach an agreement between such a large number
- Expectation always exceeds the results

### **Human Security and Arms Control**

- Calls for shift in thinking on security matters from state level to human individual level
- Human security is placed above state sovereignty and territorial integrity
- First expressed in UN Human Development Report in 1994
  - Human security has two main aspects: safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression; as well as protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions of daily life (in homes, jobs, communities)
  - Economic development, human rights and freedoms, rule of law, good governance, sustainable development, social equity – as import as arms control and disarmament
- Human Security Network established – consists of 13 states
  - Attracted many NGOs in arms control, humanitarian, aid communities, governmental
  - Realized initiatives like 1997 Treaty to Ban Landmines
- Human nature is a vague term, and lacks precision
- Roland Paris “human security is like ‘sustainable development’-everyone is for it, but few people have a clear sense of what it means”

- Vagueness of term creates contradictions
  - Material and moral consequences for intervening in human security – as well as not intervening
- Canadian human security referred to as “pinchpenny diplomacy” (cheap) and “pulpit diplomacy” (preaching morality while alienating allies)
- Force of initiatives such as Ottawa Treaty and International Criminal Court
- Unclear if it can be driving force behind arms control in absence of significant number of states to defend the idea and act according to its principals

### **International Law and Controls on War**

- Efforts to prevent/control war through international law concentrate on
  - Prohibition or outlawing of war as instrument of policy
  - Imposition of rules and regulations to establish a lawful conduct in war
- No efforts succeeded in achieving the real goal of banning use of military force, war, or aggression
- Much of the body of international law on war concerns its conduct
- Laws of war of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) – establish rules of conduct
  - Distinguishing between combatants and noncombatants (civilians)
  - Treatment of prisoners of war
  - Establishing what is considered indiscriminate attacks
  - Restrictions of carpet bombing
  - Extrajudicial executions
  - Establishment of war zones
- 1974 Inhumane Weapons Convention
- International law is frequently violated – unaware of the law or choose to violate because chances of enforcement are slim
- Difficult to keep up with technological developments; many new weapon systems not covered by international law

### **International Organizations and Conflict Management**

- Act as forum for debate and discussion, test proposals, steam valve
- Can provide third-party mediation in times of crisis or war
- Can provide legitimacy to the policies of state or group of states – can serve to constrain unilateralism
- Can promote peace and stability by establishing norms and principals of conduct and governance among their members
- Seeks to promote domestic values and systems of governance that are regarded as stabilizing and non-aggressive
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
  - Organization of American States
- Recently there has been a shift toward regional multilateral organizations as conflict management instruments
- Examples of involvement of regional organizations in conflict management
  - The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) -1949
  - The Organization of American States (OAS) - 1948
  - The Organization of African Unity (OAU) - 1963

- Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)
      - The Arab League - 1945
      - The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) - 1967
  - Trend toward regionalism in conflict management due to troubles facing UN
  - Regional organization advantages when addressing crises/wars within own region
    - Members will be more familiar with local disputes/tensions – put conflict in the hands of locals rather than the distant UN headquarters
    - Regional organizations may not be constrained by disagreements among countries at the UN
    - Regional organizations are able to respond quicker than the UN
  - Regional organization drawbacks
    - Local actors are involved – may lead some to pursue own interests in crisis
    - Some feel that local actors/regional organizations may lack neutrality
    - Often incapable of offering sufficient rewards or acting on threatened punishments
    - Most do not have a high level of political or military cohesion
    - Members are often deeply divided – agreement often difficult

### **From United Nations Peacekeeping to Humanitarian Intervention**

- From beginning UN was to “save succeeding generations from scourge of war”
  - Build around the state as a key unit in global politics
  - Balance between collective security provisions of UN and rights and sovereignty of states
- Chapter 6 & 7 of UN charter – conflict management provisions
- Chapter 6 - “Pacific Settlement of Disputes”
  - States to resolve disputes through “negotiation, enquiry, mediation...”
- UN – able to investigate disputes to determine if they endanger international peace and security – recommend resolutions for resolution
- Chapter 7 – “Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression”
  - Obligation of member states to provide forces, facilities, and transit rights
- Most significant conflict management tool performed by UN is peacekeeping
- 1945-2003 UN created 56 peacekeeping operations
- Origin of UN peacekeeping lies in use of observer and truce supervision missions
- June 1949 UN created United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization (UNTSO)
  - Supervise truce in Palestine
- 1949 UN established Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP)
- Term “peacekeeping” not coined until 1956 – Suez Crisis
  - Creation of the United Nations Emergency Force
- Conventions that came to be called “traditional” peacekeeping include
  - Impartiality
  - Non-hostile and lightly armed personnel
  - Consent
  - Keep, but don’t make, the peace
  - Military personnel

- Proper authorization
- Reliance on member states
- Non-territoriality
- United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONCU)– UN became involved in civil war
- Peacekeeping established itself as one of the most visible and respected UN functions
- Character and quality of peacekeeping began to change by 1990-91
  - Intrastate conflicts dominated international security agenda – threats of international peace and security
    - UN became extraordinarily involved in intrastate conflicts
  - Security Council was more capable of reaching agreements on the creation of peacekeeping forces
  - More optimism that UN would be able to perform as the instrument of international peace and security
    - Reflected in *An Agenda for Peace*
- Peacekeeping operations done by UN surged
  - 1988 operating 5 missions
  - 1994 operating 17 missions
- UN missions experiences a number of qualitative changes
  - Increased size
  - Deployment within states
  - Lack of consent
  - Operations in hostile environments
  - Increased use of force
  - Creation of mission tasks
  - Peace building and national reconstruction
- UN experienced time of troubles in post-Cold War period
- Mismatch between traditional peacekeeping and the intrastate communal conflicts

### **Yugoslavia**

- UN succeeded in facilitating delivery of humanitarian relief to civilian population
- UN failed to end hostilities in Bosnia-Herzegovina
- UN personnel were targets to harassment, shootings, and hostage
- Shifting of military balance, intervention of NATO, use of air strikes
  - Prompted signing of Dayton Agreement in 1995

### **Somalia**

- Initially deployed to facilitate delivery of humanitarian relief supplies
- Obstruction of UN aid and fighting prompted creation of United States-kef Unified Task Force (UNITAF)
- Initially successful; but became involved in a shooting war against one of Somalia's factions

### **Rwanda**

- Conflict between Hutu and Tutsi raging for decades
- Arusha Accords signed in August 1993 and United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda began
- 1994 organized genocide began
- UN member states refused to acknowledge genocide was underway
- 500 000 people died and more would die as world did nothing
- UN force supplied by France arrived after bulk of the killing – often protecting Rwandan troops from advancing rebel groups trying to stop genocide
  
- UN made progress in reinforcing peace in Cambodia and Angola
- Successes obscured by high-profile failures of Yugoslavia, Somalia, and Rwanda
- Criticized for being unable to manage peacekeeping operations its mounted
  - Poor communication with UN headquarters in New York
  - Shortage of long range transportation and tactical airlift
  - Uneven quality of troop contributions and incompatibility of equipment
  - Little of no capacity to gather information or intelligence
  - Slow reaction times (as much as 6 months before UN ready to deploy)
- Blaming UN can be misleading because it is member states providing resources
- Demands made upon the UN are not being matched by the resources to do the job
- Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) created 24-hour situation center to provide UN headquarters with command, control, and communication capabilities
- 1992 Department of Humanitarian Affairs (DHA) made humanitarian early warning system
- 2000 Brahimi Report released recommended
  - extensive restructuring of DPKO
  - improved capacity to react rapidly to crises
  - enhanced headquarters capable of better planning and coordination
- Effectiveness of peacekeeping in the future determined by
  - Careful consideration of demands of a proposed mission and capabilities required to carry it out
  - Willingness of contributing states to offer money and resources
  - Willingness of parties to a dispute to stop fighting and begin process of building a peace
- Peace building based on promotion of liberal values in societies torn by war
- However peace building may be an attempt at “social engineering” – could lead to more conflict
- Once again if member states do not provide resources – unsuccessful

### **Human Security and Humanitarian Intervention**

- States are now turning to regional organizations or “coalitions of the willing”
  - Operate with or without UN authority
- Human security has controversial and complex relationship with humanitarian intervention
- Genocide in Rwanda benchmark in development for human security
  - Lesson – small military force could have been conducted and would have saved many lives

- Human security suggests that intervening in international affairs is ok if governments cannot protect human security of their own people
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty – Dec. 2001 the final report was titled *The Responsibility to Protect* and argued
  - State sovereignty implies responsibility, primarily for protection of people that lie within the state itself
  - When a population is suffering serious harm and the state is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, principle of non-intervention yields to international responsibility to protect
- Report published after two cases that are considered cases of humanitarian interventions

### **NATO and Humanitarian Intervention against Serbia**

- Since creation of Yugoslavia, Kosovo has mostly been an ethnic Albanian province of Serbia
- Violence broke out between Albanian separatists (KLA) and Serbian police – early 1990s
- KLA escalated into ethnic cleansing
- NATO threatened Serbia with air strikes unless cleansing stopped
- March 24, 1999 NATO began bombing campaign lasting 78 days
- June 10 Milosevic government accepted NATO demands to withdraw security forces from Kosovo
- Some say NATO acted illegally because no UN resolution was signed, not enough time was given for diplomacy
- NATO violated rights of sovereign state and had severed Kosovo from Serbia by force
- Some say Serbia violated international law, rejected diplomatic overtures, and engaged in ethnic cleansing – something had to be done
- Canada participated in the war

### **Humanitarian Intervention in East Timor**

- Portuguese colony – 1975 invaded by Indonesia, subjected to brutal occupation
- East Timor became symbol of world's failure to respond to human rights disasters
- August 20, 1999 – people voted against remaining tied to Indonesia
- Pro-Indonesian militias reacted with campaign of violence, raiding of East Timor
- Australian-led coalition got UN approval to protect East Timorese people
- 2000 Australian-led force was replaced with UN peacekeeping force
- May 20, 2000 East Timor became independent and changed name to Timor-Leste
- Many say Humanitarian Intervention represents willingness to act in support of human rights
- The alternative, to do nothing, is unacceptable

### **Economic Statecraft, Democracy, and Conflict Management**

- Economic instruments have played large role in conflict management
  - Trade – wars prevented through economic interdependence
  - Use of economic sanctions

- Democracies do not fight – promote democracies to prevent war

### **Interdependence as a Constraint on War**

- Liberals argue that growing economic ties will reduce incentives to go to war
- Free trade would unite states and make war commercially suicidal
- War broke out because leaders didn't understand war no longer pays
- States mutually vulnerable to the damage war could cause
- War disrupts trade, eliminates markets, reduces production and access to resources
- Interdependence promotes peace because states can do better with trade than conquest

### **Sanctions and Conflict Management**

- Sanctions are coercive instruments
- Make take several forms: trade boycotts, embargoes, restriction on financial interactions
- May be imposed unilaterally by one state, or multilaterally by group of states
- When sanctions imposed, imposing country may have several aims or goals
  - Compliance
  - Subversion
  - Deterrence
  - International symbolism
  - Domestic symbolism
- Use of sanctions increased in 20<sup>th</sup> century
- Sanctions tend not to have the same strength as other instruments
  - Leverage one can exert against target state is limited
  - Sending or initiating countries incur few costs, so diplomatic measures are less credible as expressions of will or commitment
- Very lost cost, thus may be used more than military which is expensive
- Success rate is less than 26% - rate is so low because of
  - Target state is usually able to find alternative sources of supply/markets
  - Sanctions may provoke nationalist sentiments and willingness to sacrifice in name of resistance against outside interference
  - Sanctions may do the most harm to the people they are supposed to benefit
  - The longer sanctions last the more likely they are to erode or collapse
  - Imposition of sanctions can increase power of undesirable political elites
  - Initiating countries can have inflated expectations about utility of sanctions
- Sanctions should be imposed to give country incentive to change certain policies

### **A Democratic Path to Peace?**

- It is believed that democracies rarely if ever fight each other
- Clinton Administration “enlargement of the world’s community of market democracies”
- Argument that democracies don’t fight each other is based on
  - Domestic institutional structure of democratic states act as a constraint on war
  - Norms of democratic governance promote peaceful resolution of disputes

- Democracies use adjudication to avoid violent conflict
- Idea of democratic peace has been challenged
  - Institutional constraints may not prevent wars between democracies or else it would prevent democracies from going to war against any kind of opponent
  - Democracies have nearly gone to war with each other many times
  - There have been few democracies in history thus fewer opportunities for war between them
  - Democracies have actually fought one another – (definition of democracy)

### **Conclusions**

- Many obstacles for conflict management such as trust, compliance, self-interest

### **Key Terms: Chapter 7**

**Head of State:** An individual who represents the sovereignty of a state. In many cases, this individual is different from the head of government.

**Extraterritoriality:** In diplomatic practice, the tradition that visiting diplomats are exempt from local legal jurisdiction

**Camp David:** A mountain retreat for the U.S. president in Maryland and site of the famous Camp David accords, signed in 1978 by President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt and Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel

**Intifada:** a series of clashes between Palestinian youths and Israeli security forces in the occupied territories that escalated into a full-scale revolt in December 1987. The El-Aqsa Intifada began in 2000

**Verification:** process of determining that all sides of an international agreement are in compliance

**Ballistic Missile:** missile using a ballistic guidance system influenced by gravity and friction and employing no thrust after its initial boost phase; travels 300 meters to half-way around the world

**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE):** a multilateral forum for discussing a wide range of political questions in Europe; includes Canada, U.S., Russia, and all of the European states. Established in 1995 to give permanent staff and headquarters to the Council on Security and Co-operation in Europe

**Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS):** founded in 1975 to promote cooperation in West Africa; currently has 15 members

**International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty:** an international panel of experts convened to explore the issue of when the intervention in a state was justifiable in order to protect human security, commission's final report titled *The Responsibility to Protect*

**Adjudication:** deciding a legal issue through the courts or some other third party that can make a binding decision