ONE

PEACE, OR CHANGE?

"Even the lowliest men prefer being subjects to men of their own people rather than to any aliens."

—Leo Strauss (as quoted by James Atlas in the *New York Times*)

"Alien rule is intrinsically inconsistent with liberal western values; but there are worse things that can happen to any people."

—D.K. Fieldhouse, *Colonialism 1870–1945: An Introduction*

In the weeks and months following September 11, 2001, the citizens of New York City found themselves surrounded by United States military personnel as they went about their daily lives. Soldiers guarded every bridge and tunnel leading into the city. As police pulled over cars and trucks on the George Washington Bridge for routine inspections, military teams took part. Uniformed National Guard troops stood at every airport security gate in the metropolitan area, and pairs of soldiers carrying automatic rifles walked through the passenger waiting area at Newark Airport during the holiday season that December. Throughout lower Manhattan, military personnel checked everyone's identification, even blocks away from the World Trade Center site; for awhile only those who could prove they were residents were allowed into the area. At the National Guard Armory on Manhattan's Upper East Side, stern-looking soldiers in combat fatigues glared at passersby on the sidewalks, and occasionally blocked off a neighboring street or two for security reasons. Eighteen

months later when the U.S. invaded Iraq and government-declared threat levels went up again, many of these scenes were repeated. Soldiers with automatic rifles patrolled the Port Authority Bus Terminal, combat tanks stood outside the toll gates at the Lincoln Tunnel, and one Wednesday morning a half-dozen Black Hawk helicopters hovered over the Manhattan skyline during rush hour.

In one sense, these measures made the population feel secure. The troops were there to protect the area from what appeared to be the very pressing threat of terrorism. Virtually everyone in the New York metropolitan area had lost at least a friend of a friend—if not someone closer—in the World Trade Center attack, and the city was on edge. The soldiers weren't there to hassle the average citizen; they were there to deter attacks by the people who wanted to disrupt those citizens' lives. Yet at the same time the military presence caused real psychological discomfort and insecurity. It is unnerving to see heavily armed and uniformed military troops walking around on a sunny day among civilians going about their ordinary business. There is a tinge of menace inherent in the appearance of armed soldiers, something that no amount of goodwill can entirely dissipate. Their presence also made the threat seem more real. It was difficult to forget that the country felt under siege when combat troops became a normal part of the scenery.

Now change this scenario, so that the uniforms are worn by foreign soldiers, most of whom need interpreters to communicate with the locals. Make the military presence go on for years, and make it much more intrusive, with soldiers not merely stationed at bridges, airports, and depots, but actually engaged in regular foot and vehicle patrols in heavily armed units down city streets. Then put the area's laws and institutions—political, educational, and economic—under the control of the same foreigners who send in most of the troops.

These alterations make the mood a little different, even when the soldiers hail from liberal democratic states, and even when their stated goals—protecting society and making it more secure—are the same. The dangers and threats may be just as real, and the citizens may know just as clearly that the troops are there in order to keep the peace. But the psychological balance shifts. Who knows what really motivates the presence of armed foreigners on one's own soil, especially when they are directing everything from traffic to the conduct of judicial proceedings? And who knows what the citizens truly value anymore, when the country seems to function as it does only because the foreign guns are still present?

Keeping Peace and Forcing Change

This book examines the use of military troops by liberal democratic states to keep the peace and rebuild order in foreign societies. Its focus is on the operations carried out under United Nations Security Council authorization in Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor in the 1990s, but it also begins a tentative exploration of the initially more unilateral U.S. occupations of postwar Afghanistan and Iraq. The lessons of the 1990s have clear relevance for these more recent American cases—and for the second round of peacekeeping intervention that began in Haiti just as this book was going to press. Indeed in spite of the suspicion that some Washington officials have of multilateralism in general, and of the UN as an organization in particular, the administration of U.S. President George W. Bush found itself under increasing pressure to reach out to the international community to help share the burden of peacekeeping after wars it had waged. By late 2003, the American-led coalition in Afghanistan was sharing space with peacekeepers from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) who had UN authorization to deploy across the country, and the American-led coalition in Iraq finally gained an official multi-state peace mission component under UN approval.

Despite their many differences, each of these newer operations differs markedly from the older and more traditional understanding of United Nations peacekeeping that is carried out by troops wearing blue helmets. It is time for us to change our understanding of the concept of "peacekeeping," even though some in the UN community resist this transformation. It used to be that UN peacekeeping was only about ensuring that ceasefires held in various world hotspots, and about trying to prevent the immediate outbreak of renewed fighting in situations where peace agreements were fragile. (These traditional goals have still been pursued recently by UN peacekeepers in some isolated cases, like Cyprus and the Ethiopian/Eritrean border.) It also used to be that UN peacekeeping was done with the full consent of all the parties to the conflict. What sets these newer operations apart is that they were designed to go far beyond such traditional purposes. The international community for the first time took responsibility for the functioning of political societies destroyed by civil war or tyranny. In each of these newer operations the presence of foreign military troops was used by outsiders to try to control political outcomes. In each of these newer cases some parties to the conflict had to be coerced into accepting the foreign military peacekeeping presence under threat of military attack, or indeed after they lost a war to the states who then sent

in peacekeepers. In several cases—including Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq—there are significant factions to this day who do not recognize the legitimacy of the foreign troop presence in their countries, despite the UN mandates that cover those troops under international law.

In order to provoke a reconsideration of the design of these complex peacekeeping operations and of whether they have a realistic chance of establishing lasting political change in war-torn or post-tyrannical societies, this book explicitly compares them to the colonial occupations carried out by liberal democratic states at the turn of the twentieth century. Comparing complex peacekeeping operations to this type of colonialism helps highlight the dilemmas associated with attempts to control foreign societies, especially since in both cases a fundamental goal has been to make these foreign societies look more like the West. While there are many crucial differences between peacekeeping and colonialism, which will also be explored in this book, the tendency of today's international community to shy away from the comparison out of fear of being tarred with the imperialist label actually clouds our ability to see and analyze modern operations clearly.

Complex Peacekeeping and Control

When new more complex peacekeeping operations were undertaken beginning in the mid-1990s, their goal was no longer limited to stopping the immediate threat of war. Instead, these operations were undertaken in an effort to move war-torn societies on to a liberal democratic path of political development. The hope was that by establishing new political values and institutions in these countries, the representatives of western society—since these operations have been uniformly led by states or coalitions representing western values—could create a more stable and secure international environment. By remaking societies, it was thought, the fundamental underlying causes of war could be removed. These operations have hoped to build global security by encouraging lasting political change in thorny world areas.

To distinguish this new type of operation from traditional peacekeeping, and to highlight its interwoven military, political, and economic components, I refer to these new kinds of missions as "complex peacekeeping operations." Others have called them peace enforcement, peace building, or peace maintenance operations (or sometimes just "peace operations"), but this proliferation of terms and the definitions that accompany them tends to confuse the issue rather than adding real analytic heft. The Brahimi Report, issued in 2000 by an expert panel convened by UN Sec-

retary General Kofi Annan to evaluate these new missions, uses most of these terms interchangeably.[1] (Reportedly the question of whether to use the term "peacekeeping operations" or "peace operations" in the title of both the panel and the report caused so much controversy in the UN community that it almost undercut the group's work.) No two of these recent missions look exactly alike, since all of them have been structured in response to specific conditions on the ground where they are deployed. Yet all of them have evolved over time out of the first UN peacekeeping operations of the 1950s. Their designers have tried to learn from mistakes made earlier while adapting to contemporary circumstances. For these reasons, to keep the term "peacekeeping" while acknowledging the new complexity of these operations is a fitting choice.

The objectives of the international community in these new missions have been noble: to create stable, tolerant, more liberal and democratic regimes out of the wreckage of war-torn societies. In Haiti in 1994, the goal was to restore a nascent democracy that had been wiped out by a brutal military coup three years before, and to bring an end to the country's long history of violence and political mayhem under a series of malevolent dictators. In Bosnia in 1995 and Kosovo in 1999, the aim was to convince warring ethnic groups to lay down their arms, while staving off the temptation these groups faced to retaliate against each other for past wrongs. The hope was that the victims of ethnic cleansing could return to their homes and learn to live together in stable, integrated societies. In East Timor the objectives of international peacekeeping changed over time. The initial purpose of UN-backed intervention in 1999 was to rescue a newly independent territory from rampaging militias. The international community then followed this in 2000 with a plan to reinforce this territory's status as a newly sovereign state, separate from Indonesia, by helping it to create liberal democratic political and economic institutions from scratch. In Afghanistan and Iraq, the international community has wanted to shepherd in new regimes that would bring more stability and better human rights records to their countries than either the Taliban or Saddam Hussein did.

Intervention by military peacekeepers to help accomplish these goals seemed warranted in each case, because the societies in question would not move in these beneficial directions on their own after the trauma that they had undergone. Citizens needed to be protected from the bad actors among them who would otherwise undercut social and political progress, and both entrenched and emerging political leaders in these societies needed to be deterred from reverting to the intolerant and corrupt political and economic systems of the past. For these operations to be successful, the international community would have to act as a benevolent occupation force,

serving to protect and oversee societies that were thought to be not yet ready to function by themselves. The goal has been to move these struggling societies toward the path of development that was taken by the liberal democratic states who dominate the international system today.

The international community, motivated by liberal democratic principles, in other words acted with the intention of controlling political developments in foreign societies. Yet to control a society from without, using force, brings up the specter of imperialism. The idea of making foreign societies look more like liberal western democracies is not new. Perhaps surprisingly to those who have not studied the subject before, it is one of the factors that motivated the imperialism practiced by liberal states—the United States, Great Britain, and France—at the turn of the twentieth century. A wide range of analysts have in fact remarked on the resemblance of peacekeeping to imperialism. Colonel Robert C. Owen of the U.S. Air Force notes, "The naked reality of peace operations is that they are the consequence of decisions by powerful outsiders to intervene in the affairs of less well-endowed local governments, groups, and factions. . . . [They] direct or facilitate the movement of the social, economic, and political affairs of others in directions that the intervening states believe they would not go without that application of power."[2] This sounds remarkably similar to the basic definition of empire proposed by Michael W. Doyle in his seminal book on the subject: "Empires are relationships of political control imposed by some political societies over the effective sovereignty of other political societies."[3]

Some more radical critics of today's peacekeeping go so far as to accuse the international community of practicing tyranny in complex peacekeeping operations, by forcefully imposing western liberal values on societies that are by nature based on patronage networks and nationalism.[4] Much of the population in each of the peace-kept countries of today may have initially welcomed in outside support, yet many have later resented the specific contours taken by peacekeeping operations as time has gone on. When control is exercised by foreigners, domestic preferences are not always heeded. It should be remembered, as well, that imperial occupations also relied for their success on the tacit support of at least segments of the colonized population.

Imperialism and Peacekeeping: A First Cut

There are many important differences between the imperialism of a century ago and the complex peacekeeping operations of the 1990s and

beyond. Perhaps the most crucial is that imperialism was designed to take resources from the colonies for the benefit of the empires, while complex peacekeeping operations are designed with the intention of assisting target countries to become more self-sufficient. In those days intervention was carried out by states acting alone; today to be considered legitimate, intervention must be multilateral and carried out under the provisions of international law. Yet the idea of forceful intervention to create political and social change is common to both eras, and in both eras the powerful liberal democracies who led the interventions believed that such change would benefit both themselves and the target population. Their involvement in both eras was motivated at least in part by humanitarianism. Yet national interest in both eras played a significant role in their decisions.

Journalists now commonly argue that today's complex peacekeeping operations resemble imperialism.[5] John Laughland, in the British weekly *The Spectator*, compares the power of peacekeepers in Bosnia today to that held by British colonial officials from a century ago. Max Boot, former chief editorialist for the *Wall Street Journal*, argues that sending American troops on peacekeeping operations is like sending them to fight the small wars of the imperial era.[6] In 2002, Boot advocated the expansion of U.S. peacekeeping activities in Afghanistan to match those carried out by its quasi-colonial garrison in nineteenth-century Shanghai. Michael Ignatieff, in *The New York Times Magazine*, contends that UN agencies and humanitarian nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in Afghanistan have an "inherently colonial" relationship with the local population. Even efforts made by international aid agencies to empower local people, he thinks, are just "the illusion of self-government joined to the reality of imperial tutelage."[7] In Bosnia, he suggests, "our need for noble victims and happy endings" is a "narcissistic enterprise," designed to force others to be like us. He asks, "what is empire but the desire to imprint our values on another people?"[8]

Calling UN-authorized peacekeepers "imperialists" isn't new. Peacekeeping troops from NATO in Bosnia and Kosovo have been branded imperialists by those who object to the politics of ethnic tolerance that the international community is trying to institutionalize there. Australian forces leading the INTERFET mission in East Timor in 1999 were labeled imperialists by their detractors, even though INTERFET included troops from a wide range of countries in Southeast Asia and the South Pacific and had the support of most local players. United Nations officials and representatives from the NGO community are often horrified that anyone might consider what they are doing the least bit colonial. They emphasize that their actions are humanitarian and are carried out with the cooperation of

many countries, in accordance with international law. That hasn't stopped their critics.

To get foreign countries to do what the international community wants them to do, namely develop along liberal, democratic, humanitarian lines, peacekeepers have to use force to stop those who try to undercut them. They have to pick political winners and losers according to their adherence to particular values, and they have to monitor political behavior so that those who support particular outcomes in target societies can be selectively rewarded. While their ultimate goals and many of the means they used were different, that is exactly what the imperial powers of a century ago did, too.

These strategies usually failed to work over the long run. Picking new winners and losers according to their support for the occupying forces tended to disrupt long-standing social and political equilibria in foreign societies; and this bred resentment. When the imperial powers emphasized the desirability of liberal democratic ideals, they only highlighted the inconsistency of their own policies, where outsiders used force to control a foreign society rather than allowing it to determine its own path. Colonialism simultaneously often bred dependency on outside assistance to achieve societal and economic stability, even as that dependency was resented.

The complex peacekeeping cases discussed here have each faced those challenges as well. Yet if outsiders had not intervened, the populations of Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor would have continued on their trajectory of violence and chaos—although in Haiti, the initial 1994 intervention failed to keep the country from reverting to that trajectory again a decade later. In postwar Afghanistan and Iraq, the belief was that power vacuums left in the wake of brutal authoritarian regimes go on attracting reactionary Muslim militants and stirring up longstanding ethnic conflict, while corrupt warlords and common bandits would remain unchallenged. The hope, perhaps misplaced, was that outside intervention could set these societies on a more stable and liberal political path. This is where the dilemma of complex peacekeeping arises. Liberal democratic publics believe that something must be done to stop the bloodshed that foreign societies inflict on themselves, especially when the victims are innocent people. Yet the notion that outsiders can control the direction of political development in foreign societies is very often illusory.

The Additional Dilemma of Multilateralism

It is hard enough to coax liberal democratic change out of a foreign society without seeming like an occupier. Beyond this, UN-authorized peace-

keepers face an additional practical difficulty. To be considered legitimate, complex peacekeeping operations must be multilateral, representing the consensus of the international community that intervention is justified. This characteristic is what most separates them from imperialism in the eyes of many analysts. Drawing on the classic definition of multilateralism provided by John Gerard Ruggie, this means that they must be based on the participation of many different states (and in reality, of NGOs too) who have reached wide agreement on what the appropriate principles for conduct should be.[9] They must be nonexclusionary, welcoming all comers and not based on alliances of convenience. Yet this often makes coordination unworkable.

The foreigners involved in managing and carrying out these military interventions do not come from a single country or institution, but instead represent a diverse set of national and organizational interests and practices. Because they tend to be from liberal democratic states, the leaders are ultimately beholden to their domestic audiences. As Lisa L. Martin notes, multilateralism is usefully viewed as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself.[10] In this case, multilateralism is a means to legitimize foreign intervention that is being undertaken because it matches what the participants and their domestic audiences want to see happen. Each participating government is subject to differing and fickle approval ratings at home. This means that the participants in complex peacekeeping operations often champion a mutually incompatible variety of liberal democratic ideals. They do not share a common definition of what they hope to accomplish on the ground.

This is largely because no blueprint exists for how to create the perfect liberal democratic society. As several scholars have noted, including Roland Paris, Jack Snyder, and Karen Ballentine, there are elements of seemingly liberal and democratic developments that are self-contradictory. For example, pushing an economy toward market openness—a common liberal goal—can aggravate the class distinctions that motivated ethnic warfare and lead to a hardening of ethnic intolerance in society. To follow one liberal goal can undercut another. Loosening state controls over the media—which sounds good in theory in postautocratic states—can give hard-line nationalists a continuing public voice, by allowing them unfettered access to a free press.[11] If there were one agreed template to follow, about what to do when, the process of change might not be so thorny. But each foreign state and organization has its own ideas about what the direction of political change should be in the society in question and how it should be achieved. Since intervention is made legitimate by gaining wide agreement over its conduct, operations must be designed so as to be accept-

able to the full spectrum of foreign participants, and this usually means that authority is parceled out while decisions are negotiated and second-guessed over time. Inconsistency is the inevitable result, even though everyone at base would like to see these societies move in the direction of accepting liberal democracy and its system of humane values.

These operations are further complicated by the need to gain support for the process of change from the people whose mindsets are supposed to be altered. Complex peacekeeping operations are in this sense doubly multilateral, since the agreement of multiple actors matters both in terms of how they are run from the outside, and in terms of how they are structured inside foreign societies. Not only must the international community as a whole, as represented by many different states, give its approval to the intervention process if it is to be considered legitimate. But also, simultaneously, the domestic society of the country where peacekeeping forces are deployed, as represented by many different political interests and actors, must somehow be encouraged to take "ownership" of the process of change. It is this ownership that in the end proves that peacekeeping was being done with the consent of those whose polities are being changed. The goal of the foreign troops has not been really to *force* people to form liberal democracies. Instead it has been to *convince* them that this is the rational thing to do, with force used only to nudge along those who otherwise disrupt this process. In this way, the local community can continue to move forward after the international community goes home.

The need for doubly multilateral legitimacy makes it even harder for complex peacekeeping operations to achieve their goal of controlling political developments abroad than it was for the imperialists of a century ago. The empires of Great Britain, France, and the United States did not try to make their subject colonial societies take ownership of the change they instilled, because they had no intention of withdrawing their occupation forces quickly. They made no effort to foster the widest possible political participation inside their colonies. Instead they tended to select, based on their own self-interests, a particular political group or class to receive most of their attention and resources in each location. They often tried to make that class more like themselves, for example through education, so that this select group would come to believe that their own interests lay in the continuation of the empire. This was believed to reduce the cost of maintaining the colonies. In the end, the imperial powers cooperated only with their favorites in the colonies and left the less fortunate members of those societies to their own fates.

Today, in contrast, political participation by a wide variety of actors is usually a measure that peacekeepers use to define the success of their

efforts at achieving local ownership of the peace process. Peace will only be achieved, according to current wisdom, when a broad spectrum of societal groups—including people of differing ethnicities, for example—accepts the idea that the political system they live under is just and fair. Every group's voice must have the chance to have an impact on policy, and every group chased out of their homes by the violence of previous years should be encouraged to return and participate in this new political system. Peacekeeping is fundamentally about establishing justice for all in societies that have been unjust.[12] Some analysts argue that free political participation by the populace is the defining characteristic of true political sovereignty, and that intervening to reestablish such sovereignty justifies international military action.[13] Once that end-state is achieved, the peacekeepers can go home—which is what they most want to do.

The difficulty with making the pursuit of participation and equal justice the basis for peacekeeping strategy is that most of the societies where military peacekeepers are sent today have been torn apart by civil war, usually with roots stretching back into long histories of ethnic or class conflict. In some cases the states imposed on these areas are artificial constructs, not representing true societal affiliation. These societies are by definition deeply politically divided and threatened by internal violence and retribution. Letting all voices be heard can therefore lead to the reestablishment of illiberal policies by democratic means—policies that the international community vehemently opposes. Just because people are democratically elected does not mean that their policies will be just or even-handed. Yet if any voices are prevented from participating in the democratic process—such as the voices of ethnic nationalists or intolerant religious sects who claim they are only seeking the righting of past wrongs—accusations of injustice and imperialism ring out. This aggravates the dilemma of control by increasing the likelihood that liberal democratic ideals will be seen as inconsistent with each other. In Bosnia, for example, to ensure that tolerance is practiced by Serbian and Croatian hardliners who would much rather divide the country into separate ethnic states, the international community regularly ousts democratically elected officials and their appointees from office. This pattern of ousting sends the message to the Bosnian public that it is might, not voting, that makes right, even though the intention of the international community is to promote liberal democratic values. All of this further complicates the effort to coordinate the process of political change.

When there are many voices both within and outside a country, all of whom are trying to influence the direction of political reform during a messy transition period, it is hard to maintain a cohesive vision for the

future. This is true of any political transition, but the situation is made more vexing because peacekeeping missions tend to be deployed in order to contain situations that are believed to threaten international security in areas of the world that have strategic value. In other words, they are sent to places that outside countries care passionately about, because they believe that their own interests depend on how the problems in those areas are resolved. Many states want a voice in the process, because many states have a stake in the outcome.

On the other hand, it is this very multilateralism that provides complex peacekeeping operations with international legitimacy. It is what separates them from colonial efforts. If a single country, acting on its own, decides to use military force to change the political configuration of a foreign country for the sake of its own security or economic well-being, the imperialist label will be attached to its actions and it must bear that burden. Everyone has to take on faith the argument that the intervening state has good intentions, because that state alone controls and oversees its policy choices.

By late 2003, U.S. soldiers (along with some closely allied forces) in postwar Afghanistan and Iraq had been engaged for many months (in Afghanistan, almost two years) in what amounted to complex peacekeeping operations outside the multilateral UN framework. In October 2003 NATO finally sought and gained UN authorization to engage in peacekeeping activities throughout Afghanistan, breaking out of the earlier mandate that limited their activities to the capital city of Kabul; and the United States finally sought and gained UN authorization (through Security Council resolution 1511) to lead a multinational peacekeeping force in Iraq, in the face of increasingly violent insurgency there and after a great deal of stalling. But these were de facto continuations of similar missions that the United States and its closest friends did without UN authorization earlier. Military forces had already been directing political, social, and economic developments on the ground with the goal of ensuring security and stability and creating more liberal and democratic societies out of the ashes of authoritarian regimes—in other words, they had been doing peacekeeping in all but the official title. These operations simply lacked the stamp of multilateral legitimacy that had been given to what were otherwise very similar operations in Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor.

No one from the international community as a whole oversaw what the Americans and their allies were doing on the ground. In that sense, complex peacekeeping may have been coming full circle, as pundits began to talk about a new American empire. As the United States soon learned, unilateral (or small coalition) action may make operations simpler and easier to control, but it also makes maintaining political legitimacy more difficult.

It became easy for domestic opponents of these new regimes to tar those in power with the "imperialist lackey" label, and to gain support for their violent opposition to them. It also became hard for other countries to justify giving much postwar reconstruction assistance to these countries, when they were not permitted to control how their aid was used or to gain economic benefit from their participation. As the United States learned in Iraq, to ignore the call for multilateralism was to be stuck fighting a counterinsurgency war, with its attendant costs in life and treasure. If the United States had done a better job of creating a legitimate peacekeeping operation earlier on in Iraq, with more attention paid to the core tasks of security building, perhaps the ugliness that Iraq has become could have been avoided.

Failures at the Turn of the 21st Century

This intertwined set of problems—the desire by the international community to avoid being tarred with the imperial label while attempting to exert what amounts to political control over foreign societies; and the need to encourage multilateral participation to achieve legitimacy while avoiding inconsistency—sets the context for this book. Complex military peacekeeping operations in the 1990s became entangled in a terrible practical and moral dilemma: liberal democratic change cannot be forced on foreign societies using liberal democratic means.

Nowhere have the liberal democratic military peacekeeping operations of the 1990s created liberal democratic societies. They did not even create much forward momentum in that direction, in any of the countries where they were deployed. The cases will be discussed in more detail in later chapters, but a brief review of their results so far is warranted here.

In Haiti in 1994, the international community employed a series of halfway measures and found itself back at square one after years of intervention that accomplished little. After going into the country with great fanfare in 1994, peacekeepers finally withdrew again in 1999. When left to its own devices, without continuing international oversight, Haiti followed its well-worn historical path of political violence and class warfare, this time around with new players at the helm. Ten years after the military coup of 1991, not much of significance in Haiti had ultimately changed, despite years of international intervention to promote change. In 2004, the U.S. led a multinational peacekeeping operation under UN authority back into Port au Prince again, hoping that this time around it might have more lasting impact.

In the Balkans, in contrast, the international community went in with great political will and became a semi-permanent occupation force. Stability in both Bosnia and Kosovo endures to this day, but does so only because of the continuing presence of foreign military troops, years after the real war-fighting has stopped. International oversight is the only thing that keeps these areas on anything close to a liberal, multiethnic path of development. If foreign troops withdrew, both Bosnia and Kosovo would almost certainly reorganize themselves into ethnically divided territories that practiced illiberal policies toward minority groups.

Finally, the United Nations claims East Timor as a success story. The country attained independence from Indonesia, declaring its sovereign statehood in 2001, and no longer fears out-and-out warfare. Yet the continuing abject poverty of the country, and the violent rioting directed against foreigners in the capital city of Dili in December 2002, belies the notion that intervention created long-term liberal democratic stability. Foreign assistance is still desperately needed, yet the foreign presence is resented by those who lost the battle against independence, as well as by those whose hopes of a better future were raised only to be dashed when the country fell back into a sea of indifference.

In each one of these cases, peacekeeping fatigue eventually set in among the intervening forces. The states leading the operations wished to reduce their forces and save their resources for new problems that arose and appeared more central to their interests with time. The international community did succeed in ending the civil wars being fought on these territories (although in the case of Haiti that success proved fleeting); but occupation did not lead these countries toward a trajectory of liberal democratic development. The idea that peacekeeping operations could accomplish such a thing in torn societies appears to have been a failed experiment.

The administration of U.S. President George W. Bush, and especially the coterie of officials that have been labeled the new empire builders (led by Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz and Douglas Feith, Under-Secretary of Defense for Policy),[14] seemed to ignore this lesson of the 1990s. For many years U.S. defense officials in operations ranging from Haiti to Afghanistan had been eager to avoid the "colonial occupier" label.[15] They sometimes adopted inconsistent policies as a result, since their fear of being called imperialists encouraged them to shy away from commitments that could have cemented political change in areas of the world where U.S. security was at stake. By 2003 that fear evaporated, as many in Washington seemed almost to relish the idea of foregoing multilateralism and creating a new American liberal democratic empire. U.S.

officials seemed to believe that a postwar occupation in Iraq—this time without much of a multilateral component—could achieve liberal democracy through regime change. Looking back to the post–World War II occupation of Germany and Japan, and ignoring the difficulties the United States was already facing in Afghanistan, the administration adopted an optimistic best-case scenario for Iraq's future. It did so even though the population of Iraq was torn by internal ethnic conflicts, steeped in a desire for revenge against the Baath party supporters who had ruled so cruelly for so long, threatened by an upsurge of Islamic militancy among Shiites who were persecuted by the old minority Sunni regime, and surrounded by states with both the desire and the resources to interfere in Iraqi politics in a decidedly anti-liberal direction. Postwar Iraq was destined to end up looking a lot like other peace-kept societies had looked for the previous decade: unstable, violent, and with a population in need of protection by the international community.

The goal of the United States (and of the partners who eventually joined it in the occupation of postwar Iraq) turned out to be the same as the goal of complex peacekeeping missions has been: to win the voluntary support of the local population for outside military occupation that is designed to encourage political change. The aim, once again, was to cajole the society to move in a liberal democratic direction that it would not choose to take on its own. When the United States originally tried to do this without gaining multilateral legitimacy for its actions, the regime it put in place faced increasingly difficult domestic political challenges from those who labeled its supporters colonial puppets. It will be instructive in coming years to see if putting a UN patina on the occupation force truly changed that situation. The occupation will certainly create new winners and losers, and the losers will not give up quietly. And if real multilateral participation in the rule of postwar Iraq eventually occurs, then unless the lessons of the 1990s are learned, this occupation will face exactly the same dilemmas as those complex peacekeeping operations did. It will be plagued by inconsistency and mixed messages that leave the population perplexed, and far from the liberal democratic trajectory that was Washington's original hope when it went in to topple Saddam Hussein.

Plan of the Book

This book takes a deeper look at the comparison between peacekeeping and colonialism, focusing on the key concept that links the two: attempts by outsiders to control foreign societies. Similar political impulses have

triggered and then undermined both types of foreign intervention. Powerful states have been the vital players in both eras, and the mistakes they made when they tried to control their colonies have been mirrored in later years (albeit in a better-intentioned, less violent, and more multilaterally sanctioned fashion) in their attempts to shape the future of societies torn by conflict or plagued by tyranny.

As noted above, this book focuses on one particular type of peacekeeping mission—the complex UN-authorized military operations that began to appear in the 1990s in Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor, and that emerged in Afghanistan and Iraq as time went on—and on one type of colonial imperialism—the kind practiced by the liberal states of Great Britain, France, and the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. These particular forms of peacekeeping and colonialism were chosen for comparison because they have important characteristics in common. As both Boot and Ignatieff have noted, the *military* tasks required of today's peacekeepers in many ways resemble the tasks taken on by the military forces of the imperial era. In fact some of the techniques used by peacekeeping forces today have their doctrinal roots in that earlier time in history. There is an even more notable similarity in the key *political* goals lying behind the two kinds of operations, despite their many differences. Both types of operation have sought to institutionalize political change in societies where change would not happen without outside intervention, and both have required the use of force to achieve their goals.

Both types of operation have also been motivated at least in part by humanitarianism. My choice to study the liberal empires of a century ago is quite intentional. Unlike the colonialism practiced by the brutal King Leopold II of Belgium, for example, the colonialism practiced by London, Washington, and Paris was not simply about grabbing land or exploiting resources or exerting control over subject populations (although it certainly was about all of these things, as well). It was an attempt to remake other societies in the imperialists' own image, and to bring to them what were seen to be the benefits of western civilization. Colonialism as practiced by liberal states at the turn of the twentieth century, like many complex peacekeeping missions today, was designed to move foreign societies in the direction of adopting European and American political and economic values and institutions.[16] This fact sets both kinds of operations apart from the kinds of wars and invasions more typically associated with the use of force, where the goal is simple conquest or victory rather than institutional restructuring.

This book is not intended as a comprehensive history of either turn-of-the-twentieth-century colonialism or of the complex peacekeeping opera-

tions of recent times. Plenty of good histories of those events already exist. Instead it is designed as an analytic exercise, to evaluate the usefulness of attempts by outsiders to control political developments in foreign societies with the use of what amounts to military occupation. Both the imperialism practiced by liberal states a century ago and complex peacekeeping operations have been motivated by a desire to restructure weak and impoverished societies for the sake of security in the developed world. It would be a mistake for today's peacekeepers to ignore the lessons of history out of squeamishness about the imperial label. Now that some U.S. leaders seem to have contemplated the establishment of a new liberal democratic empire of their own, the lessons of both the imperial past and recent peacekeeping history have particular relevance, and one can only hope that American policymakers take heed. Empire and peacekeeping have become intertwined as never before.

Three particular findings stand out from the comparison. First, powerful states in both eras have lacked the political will that would be necessary to truly gain control over political developments in foreign societies. Even when apparently strong security motives have underpinned these operations, they have been plagued by inattention from their capitals, resulting in inconsistent actions and ultimately ineffective policies. We should not expect coherence in the goals or methods employed by liberal democratic states; instead, those states should limit the objectives they seek in order to avoid sending the mixed messages that undermine their efforts. Second, and closely related to the first, military organizations then as now are one of the factors contributing to the lack of clear direction we find on the ground. Their natural tendency to reward their members for seeking battlefield glory, combined with the likelihood of either too little or too much oversight from civilian leaders back home, complicates the process of keeping the peace. Yet third, the imperial era makes clear that when properly directed to do so, disciplined soldiers can do a good job of providing public order—something that today's political leaders should be emphasizing as the size of peacekeeping tasks in the world outstrips civilian resources. The tasks performed by imperial soldiers in many ways match what is being asked of today's peacekeepers, and we should therefore not pretend that peacekeeping tasks are unprecedented or out of the realm of military competence. When these three findings are combined, it means that peacekeepers should try to limit their goals but expand their expectations of what military forces can reasonably do. Rather than trying to transform foreign societies, peacekeepers should be directed toward providing security and preventing anarchy in unstable regions of the world.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of how complex peacekeeping operations

evolved in the 1990s. This chapter demonstrates that complex peacekeeping today, unlike the UN operations of the past, is centered on the idea of trying to control foreign societies. The goals of the international community underwent a transformation in this period, from the traditional peacekeeping operation's purpose of merely stopping war, to the more intrusive aim of shaping the political development of previously war-torn societies. Liberal democratic societies were thought to be less likely to go to war again in the future, and therefore political transformation came to be seen as the ultimate goal of humanitarian intervention. This is where the dilemmas of control, as well as the resemblance to colonial operations of the past, began to arise.

Chapter 3 explores the motives underlying the colonialism practiced by the liberal great powers a century ago, and juxtaposes them against those impelling the complex peacekeeping operations of the 1990s and today. This chapter demonstrates that despite all of their differences, both types of operation were pursued for a similar combination of reasons that straddled national security interests and humanitarianism. The balance between the two sets of motives in the two eras differed; humanitarianism was more of an afterthought in the colonial period than it is today. Yet the prospect of controlling foreign political developments in both eras served the security interests of the intervening states, even as it furthered their humanitarian purposes as they were defined at the time. It is thus worth considering the difficulties that the colonial powers faced in getting their goals met. In both eras, the international community was divided between the advanced states on the one hand, who had long ago succeeded in creating liberal democratic political institutions for themselves and felt justified in sharing their wisdom in these matters with others, and subject territories on the other, who needed the helping hand of outsiders to move forward into a better future.

Chapter 4 details an additional surprising political similarity between the imperial and complex peacekeeping eras: the absence of sufficient political will on the part of the intervening states, both empires and peacekeepers, to ensure that what their capitals intended was actually possible given the resource constraints they faced. Then as now, attempts to control foreign territory for the sake of external security became mired in inadequate political will to maintain consistent policies and excessive concerns about cost. Within this basic framework of similarity, the two eras were indeed different in important ways. The colonial era witnessed the arbitrary decisions and atrocities of colonial governors who were out of the control of their capitals and publics back home. The peacekeeping era instead witnessed the deployment of security forces who were discouraged

for political reasons from doing enough to actually maintain security. Yet the ultimate consequences in the two eras were similar nonetheless, in that the intervening states, a century apart, kept their attention and interest focused elsewhere, and their ability to direct change in foreign societies suffered as a result.

Chapter 5 uses the cases of NATO operations in Bosnia and Kosovo to examine the military tasks performed on complex peacekeeping operations. On the one hand, what is being asked of peacekeepers today is quite similar to the actions performed (often successfully) by imperial soldiers a century ago. On the other hand, the need for multilateral coordination of military activities today makes them much harder to plan well and perform right. Multilateralism is the one thing that removes any hint of individual state gain from what might otherwise appear to be a colonial effort—an element that was missing in earlier times, and was again missing in U.S. policy toward Iraq throughout most of 2003. Yet the need for multilateral cooperation is what often most undermines the effectiveness of such intervention in today's world, as multiple actors pursue differing agendas within the rubric of liberal democratic development. This is true even in the NATO alliance, whose members are presumed to share an underlying political and security vision. The chapter concludes by comparing NATO peacekeeping cases in the Balkans to the Australian-led intervention in East Timor in 1999, where multilateral, UN-authorized participation in the mission was managed by a single lead state, with a greater degree of success than what was seen in the Balkans. Australian actions taken then can serve as a model for future peacekeeping operations now—something of particular relevance as this book was going to press, as the United States began to lead UN authorized multilateral operation in both Iraq and Haiti.

In the final chapter I turn to the question of what a potential solution to these twin dilemmas of control and multilateralism might look like. What this chapter proposes in places such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Haiti, where international control is necessary to prevent anarchy from overwhelming the security interests of liberal democratic states, is a new form of peacekeeping. Unlike traditional peacekeeping, it recognizes the need for robust military force to be used flexibly by interested state actors. Unlike the complex peacekeeping of the 1990s, however, it recognizes that attempting to control a country's political society through the use of outside intervention is usually both inefficient and unworkable. This new model, which I call "security-keeping," limits intervention by states after a war or humanitarian crisis to the more traditional peacekeeping goals of ending the fighting and restoring basic security, rather than attempting the kind of political and economic control that was tried in Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor.

At the same time it encourages outside states to employ military forces flexibly and over the long term, so that new governments have the opportunity to truly gain a foothold in controlling their own territory before the international community withdraws. It requires reconfiguring the reward systems inside military organizations—especially in the United States, which because of its immense relative wealth and power will be called on to play a leading role in most of these operations—to recognize that peacekeeping is a necessary component of the national interest in an era where anarchy abroad is a major threat to the stability of liberal democratic states. This chapter draws out the lessons from the stories told in previous chapters, and presents a set of policy recommendations for those who would attempt to intervene in order to keep the peace abroad today.