SIX

SECURITY AS A STEP TO PEACE

Why Peacekeeping Still Matters

In recent years a new trend has emerged in world affairs. The United States, usually with the support of a few selected allies, has gone to war far from its borders for the explicit purpose of replacing existing political regimes with ones more congenial to U.S. interests and values. Whether the stated goals were humanitarian, as in Kosovo, or designed to protect Americans from the threat of terrorism, as in Afghanistan and (according to President George W. Bush) Iraq, these military interventions have gone forward without United Nations Security Council authorization.

Yet despite deep-seated official U.S. skepticism about UN capabilities and political motives, sooner or later Washington has been forced to turn back to some form of multilateralism to get the support it needs to ensure security and reconstruction in these countries after the wars are over. While it is now common to refer to the United States as a new imperial power, the truth is that the U.S. acting alone lacks the political will to establish a real empire. Americans do not want to devote the time and resources (in terms of both troop numbers and financing) that are necessary for a long-term occupation regime to succeed. Unlike the colonial era of a century ago, the public sees too little gain to justify the expenditure of lives and tax dollars that a long-term unilateral occupation entails. There is neither much profit nor much competitive strategic value to be had from controlling territory far from home.

It is not surprising, then, that U.S.-led NATO intervention in Kosovo

without UN approval was followed by a UN-authorized complex peace-keeping operation, as Clinton administration officials turned over duties of reconstruction and reestablishing order to the international community even as Washington preserved a key role for itself in the mission. U.S.-led intervention in Afghanistan was again followed by a UN-authorized complex peacekeeping operation in the capital of Kabul, even though Washington insisted on maintaining military control over outlying, less stable areas of the country for almost two years afterward. In October 2003, finally UN authorization was sought and achieved for a country-wide complex peacekeeping operation under NATO command. And while the U.S. resisted turning to the UN in Iraq, eventually the UN Security Council authorized a U.S.-commanded complex security keeping operation there, too. In July 2003, both India and France had disappointed U.S. officials by refusing to send troops to the country in the absence of such a resolution. As violence—including against UN humanitarian facilities in the country—skyrocketed, it became evident that American troops lacked both the resources and political support back home to do the job of keeping security by themselves, and eventually a compromise resolution was passed by the UN in October 2003. Meanwhile a new peacekeeping mission was getting underway in Liberia as well, and in early 2004 events in Haiti once again led the U.S. to turn to the UN to authorize a new operation there. Around the globe there are simmering conflicts that could burst onto the headlines at any moment, calling out for peacekeeping forces to be deployed.

This means that as time goes on, the lessons of the complex peacekeeping operations of the 1990s remain relevant, despite the American predilection for unilateral action.

The dilemmas outlined in this book are not going away any time soon. Tensions will continue between the desire to control political developments on the ground and the lack of political will to do so. There will also be ongoing strains between the requirements that operations be on the one hand cohesive, and on the other legitimized through multilateralism and local ownership of the peace process. Given the political realities of the world we live in, what do the perspectives presented here tell us about how these dilemmas can be resolved?

Lack of State Will

The colonial operations carried out by liberal states at the turn of the twentieth century and the complex peacekeeping operations of more recent years had one key component in common, despite all their differences.

They were characterized by the desire of outsiders to control political events happening on the ground abroad. Whether for self-interested security motives or genuine humanitarianism, western liberal democratic states wanted these foreign regions to adopt more of the values and institutions of the western liberal democratic world. In more recent times this goal was shared by significant portions of the peace-kept populations, but a substantial fraction of the target population has in each case opposed the international presence, which is why the use of robust military force has been necessary. While the balance of reasons for undertaking these operations shifted between the two eras, favoring state self-interest in the former period and humanitarianism in the latter, the desire for foreign control over political and social institutions was a constant.

Perhaps the most important lesson to come out of the preceding chapters is that even when liberal democratic states appear to have strong interests in gaining control over foreign societies, they will almost always lack the political will to follow through on their plans with cohesive, well designed operations. Competing political goals get in the way. It has become a truism to make this argument about peacekeeping. UN corridors frequently echo with laments about the absence of political will among member states. But this characteristic of liberal democracies isn't new; an absence of political will was a defining characteristic of the colonial period as well. Colonial hegemony as practiced by the U.S., France, and Great Britain often lacked cohesion and consistency, because the capitals did not have the will or the resources to adequately oversee the man-on-the-spot. This was the case even when empire was seen as being central to how states defined their competitive standing in the international system, and when foreign territory was such an important possession that the capitals decided to send out personnel to occupy it. Ultimately, this lack of consistency is one of the things that led to colonialism's failure, because insufficient oversight was associated with on-the-ground brutality, as well as with mixed messages about which political values the empires held most dear.

What this means is that the lack of political will to do things right and well in foreign countries is not just an artifact of modern peacekeeping operations, and it is not something that is likely to be solved just by authorizing lead states or so-called coalitions of the willing to act. The problem goes beyond the willingness of interested states to lead operations; it extends to the willingness to maintain sufficient political interest to coordinate those operations well once they are in place. There is unlikely ever to be sufficient political will in the current international system by any liberal democratic state or coalition to put together a coherent, long-term operation whose purpose is to direct political developments abroad. This

fact should matter to the international community, because it implies that the lack of forceful will when dealing with peace operations and governorship of foreign countries is a permanent feature of the foreign policy of powerful states.

There is a tendency among peacekeeping analysts and advocates to try to persuade countries like the United States to act with more will on peacekeeping operations. The Brahimi Report issued by the UN Secretary General in 2000, for example, is filled with suggestions about how member states (and the United States in particular is often implied in its criticisms) must create mandates for operations that match the resources available to them, and must follow through on their good intentions with adequate financing and personnel.[1] What is missing from that report is the question of exactly where the political will to do this is going to come from. Similarly many authors seem to approach the future in the belief that if the great powers are simply criticized enough for their failure to act or to act cohesively and rationally in peacekeeping, then eventually they can be made to act. Dozens of books have been written that urge the United Nations and/or the United States to do more and to do peacekeeping better.[2]

But one thing the comparison to colonialism brings out is how little things have changed in the past hundred years. Despite an enormous revolution in norms, for example, that makes blatantly colonial behavior now unacceptable, international society has not adopted a norm that manages to create political will where there is none, no matter how good the cause might seem. What this means for policy planners is that we should *expect* a lack of will and consistency, rather than being surprised by its absence. In the colonial era the key characteristic associated with this inconsistency was man-on-the-spotism, as the capitals' intentions were undermined by colonial officials in the field. In the current era, it may be the privileging of casualty avoidance over peacekeeping mission accomplishment, or the notion that military forces can't do policing even when there's no one else to do it.

In both eras, this inconsistency has been unavoidable, given the vicissitudes of public attention in liberal democratic states and the relatively low priority that both military occupation and peacekeeping have held on the agenda in comparison to preparing for major war. Rather than simply lamenting this lack of political will, the international community should figure out how peacekeeping operations can be better deployed *given* that they will often occur with poor coordination, with mixed and even incompatible goals, and with insufficient funding and resources. For those who truly want to transform the politics and culture of foreign societies in the name of liberal democracy, there should be no expectation that complex

peacekeeping operations—or anything else demanding coordinated liberal democratic state action—are the best way to accomplish it.

Why Germany and Japan Don't Work as Models

In theory, might it not be possible for liberal democracies to impose political control abroad, through a carefully directed military occupation policy? After all, critics might point out, military occupation worked just fine to turn Germany and Japan into functioning liberal democracies after World War II. But what sets those two cases apart from both the colonial regimes that preceded them and the complex peacekeeping operations that arose later was the balance of political opportunity and will, between the occupiers and the occupied.

World War II was a total war, fought by the United States and its European allies at great cost, in the belief that their survival as independent states (and as an overarching liberal democratic society) depended on victory. This meant that in the occupation era, the political will of the occupiers to ensure the success of reforms was immense, because everyone was frightened about what a resurgence of Japanese or German militarism would mean. Simultaneously, the level of civilian destruction in both Japan and Germany was horrific, following lengthy fire-bombing campaigns in both countries and the use of atomic weapons in Japan. On both sides, World War II was seen as a total war, and on both sides, enemy civilians were considered fair targets. The allies fought on until they were able to wrest unconditional surrender from their enemies. For the populations of occupied Japan and Germany, this meant that there was no credible political alternative to bowing to the conquerors. The victors had demonstrated their political will to win at any cost. Since resistance would only cause a prolongation of warfare and further suffering, violent opposition to the occupiers was rare.

Bush administration officials who wished to make the occupation of Iraq seem typical in historical terms claimed in August 2003 that there were frequent attacks against U.S. occupation troops in Germany by renegade Nazis immediately after the war.[3] However, the definitive U.S. Army history of the postwar German occupation negates this. While threats of violence against U.S. troops were issued, and rumors of anti-American violence abounded, actual attacks were rare—and many appeared to be personal vendettas against soldiers whose relative wealth and prestige made them attractive to German women in a time of hardship.[4] Most crime in postwar Germany actually involved black marketeering, rather than

anti-Americanism, and tended to be associated with displaced ethnic German foreigners who did not want to go back to their countries of origin. In the words of a major review published by the RAND Corporation think tank in mid-2003, "no resistance of consequence emerged [following the surrender of German armed forces] or at any time thereafter."[5] Incidentally, the low level of anti-American violence in both countries was probably also partly explained by the fact that neither German nor Japanese officials from the old regimes would have been welcome to use surrounding countries to plot further actions against the allies, since nearby territories had been the primary victims of what were particularly cruel empires.

There are many who explain the success of democratization in Germany and Japan as being based on those societies' ethnic homogeneity, or preexisting acceptance of Western values (Japan actually went through a very pro-American cultural period at the turn of the twentieth century). Yet those factors do not explain their acceptance of outside domination at the hands of the Americans and others. Good evidence has emerged in recent years that the American occupations of Germany and Japan were rather ugly, and not uniformly welcomed by their inhabitants, at least not to the degree that popular lore in the United States has suggested. The Japanese were burdened by grinding postwar poverty, near-starvation diets, disease and overcrowding, a corrupt government, and looting and economic sabotage that lasted for several years after Tokyo's 1945 capitulation. Furthermore, many locals recognized the irony of having democracy imposed from on high. Yet any Japanese attempts to criticize or even lampoon the occupation forces for their contributions to these problems were censored by the American military.[6] Meanwhile, the Germans immediately after the war suffered under an American directive that limited relief supplies, including food, to what was necessary to prevent the outbreak of rioting and disease. The nation that was the aggressor in the war was not to be given any favoritism in its immediate aftermath. Agricultural products were requisitioned from farmers by the occupation force, and hunger was common, even as U.S. troops patronized the thriving black market.[7] It was not until several years later that the Marshall Plan lent a helping hand to German recovery.

Yet rebellion was rare, at least in part because there were no credible alternatives to submission to the occupation authorities, especially among people who were exhausted and in despair. This meant that the American public was not confronted with regular reports of casualties among the occupying troops, as they are today for the cases of Afghanistan and Iraq. No one in Germany or Japan thought they could make the occupiers go home. (And yet the pressure to bring the boys home was high in the United

States anyway; that was one of the major reasons why the initial occupying force in Germany was quickly replaced by a specially recruited constabulary military force.[8]) In comparative terms, this means that despite their complexity, their physical hardship, and the hard moral decisions that had to be made, the occupations of Japan and Germany were relatively easy duty for the troops who manned them in comparison to today's efforts. There was no room for domestic political spoilers.

Most peacekeeping operations today, as well as other occupations designed to bring order to unstable areas of the world, will not share these political characteristics with Japan and Germany. The liberal democratic states of today for the most part do not feel that their survival is threatened by postwar Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, or Iraq, and therefore do not have the will to ensure that major occupations last indefinitely. Despite the shock of September 11 and the spate of related terrorist attacks that have followed, the threat emanating from particular foreign states does not seem large enough to warrant a permanent foreign governing presence. While President Bush's September 2002 National Security Strategy highlighted the dangers posed by "weak states" and "chaos" in the fight against terror,[9] the focus of domestic debates by Summer 2003 was on the need to bring U.S. troops home from Afghanistan and Iraq, not on the question of whether anarchy in those territories posed ongoing threats for core U.S. national security interests. Bush's statement also listed the need to combat "disease, war, and desperate poverty" in Africa as a strategic priority linked to combating terrorism, yet both the Pentagon and significant members of the U.S. Congress were reluctant to endorse sending U.S. troops as peacekeepers to the failed African state of Liberia in 2003.

Because of the power of information technology in the modern world, people on the ground in Afghanistan and Iraq were well aware of American ambivalence, and even of the history of similar ambivalence in Somalia. So attacks against U.S. troops and their allies in both Afghanistan and Iraq continued, as their perpetrators hoped to convince the American public that it was high time to withdraw. And since most of today's conflicts reflect regional tensions that extend far beyond state borders, opponents to peacekeeping and occupation regimes can often find nearby supporters to turn to for outside help. When these things are combined, it means that spoilers today have plenty of reason to believe that credible alternatives to internationally mandated solutions exist, if they just hold on long enough to put themselves in a better political position. A repeat of Japan and Germany is unlikely. The need for robust, combat-prepared forces in peacekeeping operations who are willing to stay the course over the long term to achieve security is not going to disappear anytime soon.

Tasks for the Military

In both the colonial era and in complex peacekeeping operations, the effects of low political will in the capitals have been magnified by military organizations who accorded a relatively low priority to occupation duties. In the colonial era this was associated with massacres and atrocities that went against rational thinking about how to gain control over a foreign society. In the current era it is associated with inadequate attention to the less glamorous aspects of security. Preparing for policing is sacrificed to preparing for war-fighting, even though adequate international police forces are not available to quell the riots and the humanitarian aid convoy raids that undercut effective peace operations—and even though societal anarchy is now associated with opportunities for terrorism. As we saw in the cases of Haiti in 1994, and Bosnia and Kosovo in the years that followed, many western military organizations today are uncomfortable with the notion of policing. They either try to avoid doing it even when circumstances thrust it upon them, or they do it without adequate attention to the need to get and keep local opinion on their side. Their mindsets are often not geared toward hearts and minds campaigns.

But as we saw in the case of Australia in East Timor, there are liberal democratic military organizations who can do policing well in difficult circumstances. The Australian Defence Force guarded the borders, protected humanitarian aid convoys, secured first towns and then the outlying areas against rebels and bandits, and (when necessary) confronted militia members directly and detained them in rebuilt prisons. And perhaps surprisingly, one positive lesson that the colonial era provides is that when military troops are well trained and supervised, they can take on these tasks and still retain their reputation for military toughness. It is hard to accomplish this; it requires constant oversight and a consistent policy at higher levels of rewarding soldiers for their positive actions and punishing them when they break good conduct norms. But military effectiveness and peacekeeping effectiveness are not at odds with each other. This means that there is room for change in the area of what military troops are prepared to do on peacekeeping operations. The lack of flexibility in some military organizations' approach to peacekeeping is something that can be improved.

State leaders in liberal democracies can instruct the military commanders under their control to raise the priority they give to peacekeeping. Of course, to make this change also takes political will. It requires change in defense budget priorities, so that more attention is paid to having large numbers of high-quality personnel prepared to serve abroad for extended

periods. In the case of the U.S. Army in particular, this would mean relying less on reserve forces, who are difficult to deploy for long periods of time on hazardous operations because of their emotional and financial attachments to jobs and families at home. Instead, the United States would have to increase the size of active duty troops—and pay the costs of the salaries, benefits, and hazard pay that goes along with the decision to hire a larger volunteer force. Political debate on this point had begun by fall 2003, and it was clear that the cost would be in the billions.[10]

It also requires undertaking what might become a pitched bureaucratic fight, as top military leaders are instructed that their job is not just to plan, deter, and win wars, but to make sure their troops are ready to keep the peace well, too. Military organizations for the most part do not like going to war, because they are the ones who suffer the consequences of battle. But when they are sent into dangerous situations they would rather fight and win through force than restrain their fire power to win the peace. It is a well-established chestnut of civil-military relations theory that military organizations prefer to go on the offense and take the initiative, and to follow what has become known as the "Powell Doctrine" in the United States (after the thinking of then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell): use decisive force, and have an exit strategy after the battle is won.[11] Long-term peacekeeping and occupation don't fit this template.

Hence doctrinal innovation would need to be ingrained into military organizations to make the change last. In many ways this would require a revolution in how the U.S. military in particular thinks of itself, since U.S. leadership (or at least support) appears necessary for most peacekeeping operations to go forward these days. It would demand that political leaders appoint as their top military advisers and commanders people who share a belief that foreign anarchy is a source of domestic danger. As time goes on, it has become clear that there are senior officers in the U.S. armed forces who believe that some variation on that kind of transformative policy would serve U.S. security interests.[12] Yet they are far from the majority. Major doctrinal innovation in military organizations is most easily undertaken by powerful insiders, not by civilian outsiders who can be sidelined or undercut by those who have something to lose from change.[13] Any change will therefore likely be slow and bumpy.

The amount of training time allocated to policing actions and other flexible uses of force and restraint would have to be increased. The change would require making room for a focus on people skills and cultural awareness, not just technology skills, in military training. This obviously can be done, because it is something that U.S. Special Operations Forces, for example, already do. But it would involve shaking up standard operating

procedures, and that will likely threaten those who have succeeded in the current environment. In particular, soldiers and officers who excel at peacekeeping duties would have to be given as great a chance at promotion to the top ranks as people who excel at war-fighting; as in colonial times, promotion incentive structures will otherwise reward those who go for the glory. But given the level of postwar casualties that American troops have experienced in Iraq in particular, the time may now be ripe for such a revolution to occur. It is clear that the current system is not working well enough, and this may mean that a critical mass inside the military bureaucracy can be convinced that change is inevitable.

There are other alternatives. If the U.S. military and citizenry decide that America should not do peacekeeping, only war-fighting, then one alternative choice is to go home after the hot-war phase is over. If diplomatic channels are used with sufficient effectiveness, perhaps the European states and Canada can be convinced to do all the multilateral peacekeeping jobs that will rise up in the future. Obviously, this was not done during the Iraq crisis; the decision to act unilaterally undercuts the ability to gain postwar support. Such a division of labor would also require the gathering of political will in allied countries to enact massive increases in defense budgets and military recruitment, as well as to cooperate with the United States, at a time when antimilitarism is strong and suspicion of American imperial intentions runs high. Given that this scenario is unlikely, another alternative would be American isolationism—a refusal to become involved abroad militarily. Yet the cost of this latter decision would be standing by as witnesses not only to future Bosnias and Rwandas, but to the growth of anarchy that al Qaeda finds so conducive to its activities.

Change in the way that the U.S. military defines its role is hence in some sense the easiest, and is certainly the most rational, solution to the new problems faced in international security today. Such a change will only be possible in a liberal democratic state like the U.S. if the public is explicitly told every time there is deployment of troops to a peacekeeping or occupation operation that casualties are to be expected, and that those casualties are an acceptable cost of an action that is in accordance with core U.S. security interests. This will again mean that political will must be exercised by state leaders. There is a great deal of evidence that the American public does not object to casualties on peacekeeping operations per se. It only objects to the idea of sacrificing American lives for an unclear purpose.[14] Making this argument will be a challenge for policymakers, one that requires spending political capital to convince a reluctant public that peace and order in a far-off foreign country matters for domestic tranquility. Given the experience of September 11, however, as well as continuing evi-

dence of the existence of transnational terrorist networks that operate from unstable regions, a convincing case can be made for the idea that preventing anarchy abroad is in not just the national interest, but the interests of the western world and its values in general.[15]

Limiting the Goals

Resolving both of these problems—recognizing that foreign political intervention will not be coherent, and convincing both the military and the public to get on board for greater levels of peacekeeping activity—will be easier if one fundamental shift is made in the approach to peacekeeping operations: intervention should not try to accomplish so many abstract goals. It is hard to make the case that it is in U.S. interests to create a functioning democracy in Iraq, in the face of mounting evidence that many Iraqis do not share American views of what their own political future should be. It is also hard to continue to argue that Kosovo will be at peace only when it is ethnically integrated, given that the calmest areas there are the ones where ethnic homogeneity is the highest, and the ethnically split city of Mitrovica remains the least stable. It would be easier to make the case that preventing anarchy in Iraq, by providing a minimal level of public security until a stable state can get up and running, is a way to stem the threat of terrorism that may reach beyond Iraqi borders. It was, after all, anarchy that allowed al Qaeda to train and flourish in Afghanistan before September 11. It would also be easier to make the case that the purpose of having troops in Kosovo is to ensure that people don't kill each other in large numbers while they are sorting out on their own what kind of future for that territory makes the most long-term sense.

The history presented here suggests that given the difficulty liberal democracies have in imposing coherent political influence over foreign societies, the limited goal of establishing security over the medium term is more likely to be achievable. In the colonial era, attempts to instill supposedly western values throughout the empire ultimately backfired, as the population recognized the inconsistencies in the policies of the imperial states. In many cases it appears that it was the brutality of the imperialists, rather than their humanitarianism, that most influenced the later development of politics in postcolonial territories. While complex peacekeeping operations have not been so brutal, the inconsistencies within the liberal democratic values they have proclaimed, as well as the inevitable lack of cohesive follow-through on planning, have demonstrated that the notion of imposing liberal democracy abroad is a pipedream. Hence in Bosnia we

have a supposed democracy overseen by a foreigner with veto power over election results; in Kosovo we have public arguments between U.S. military officials, UN officials, and NGOs about who is politically deserving of assistance, while the international overseers are so suspicious of their charges that constitutional self-determination is not allowed; and in East Timor the international community has created a brand new country that relies on foreign assistance to function even as foreign influence is resented.

What makes more sense in peacekeeping and occupation operations is to provide security for countries in the aftermath of war and civil unrest, while the politics are sorting themselves out. This would in some sense mean taking back a more traditional model of peacekeeping, where the goals are limited to stopping the violence and preventing its resurgence. But it would mean doing it better than has been done in the past, by recognizing that what is needed are robust military forces that are applied flexibly to meet the real needs of the societies where they are sent. They must expect to do riot control when new governments choose policies that threaten old interests. They must expect to protect humanitarian aid deliveries when bandits threaten the highways. They must expect to pull guard duty, when new governments lack the security forces to defend key installations. They must also go in with the expectation that they will need to stay on the ground for several years, until a new domestic government can pull itself into place—and that they will have to put a lot of resources and effort into training new security forces on the ground to take their place when they leave.

It is not enough to go into an unstable country, forcibly unseat an old regime, hold new elections, and then leave. The international community learned this in Cambodia and repeated the mistake in Haiti in 1994. It is also not sufficient to provide a cordon against outside interference while allowing internal rioting and other forms of political violence to continue. The international community learned this in the IFOR deployment in Bosnia, and then had the lesson repeated many times during the SFOR period in Bosnia and the KFOR deployment in Kosovo when coordination between the NATO command and individual military units broke down. (Many of these latter instances—for example the Bank Hercegovacka takeover attempt by the OHR in Bosnia, or the UN's efforts to forcibly integrate Kosovars back into the Serbian-dominated area of Mitrovica— simultaneously showcase the difficulties of maintaining political and military consistency when the goal is to bend domestic political situations to the international community's desires.) Providing security in foreign society requires changing expectations, especially Washington's expectations, about what it is that military forces do.

What I propose here is a narrower definition of "security" than what many from the NGO community, for example, would prefer. What I mean by security is what the seventeenth-century British philosopher Thomas Hobbes meant when he talked about the role of the state, the so-called leviathan, in holding anarchy at bay. Security, from this perspective, means that commerce can be practiced, and the arts can flourish, because most people don't fear for their lives on a daily basis.[16] It does not imply that society is perfect, or even particularly just; it merely means that society is capable of functioning. Borders are controlled, terrorism is curtailed, and the government does not face constant threats of violent overthrow.

To many voices from the liberal international community, this definition is inadequate. It is only the achievement of basic human rights for everyone that constitutes true security. While ultimately this broader definition may be correct, my point here is that these broader goals cannot be accomplished by force, unless that force is applied consistently over a period of many years, perhaps until a generational change takes place. The international community does not seem capable of accomplishing this; it cannot even decide, in peace-kept countries like Bosnia, to allow human rights courts to function without interference when its own security interests are threatened. If human rights are to be protected, perhaps it is better done through the "spotlight" effect, where NGOs publicize human rights shortcomings and convince liberal democratic western states to withhold aid and put other political pressure on such countries. It is already asking a lot of military organizations to do basic security tasks well, and it would be more realistic to tailor our expectations to their capabilities.

Solving the Dilemma of Multilateralism

The search for multilateral support for peacekeeping intervention makes all of these issues even harder to solve. The greater number of states that are involved in a mission, the less likely it is that the aims will be coherent, and that all of the troops involved will be capable of carrying out flexible duties well. Multilateralism leads to a greater chance for slippage. Yet international involvement is necessary for operations to be considered legitimate. This matters not just for the intervening forces, but also for the new governments that emerge out of the chaos of conflict. For them to be able to establish any sense of popular support and longevity, they must not be seen as the puppets of a single outside, outlier state. In other words, they must not be seen as the beneficiaries of imperialism. Instead, they need to be seen as representatives of the will of the international community as a whole.

While multinational control over a mission often leads to incongruity and disarray, as we have seen in both Bosnia and Kosovo, it is possible to work through the UN to get UNSC support for an operation and multilateral participation in it, while keeping operational command in a single, interested country. We saw this in the example of Australia's leadership of the Interfet mission to East Timor. Something similar has already begun to emerge in Afghanistan, where NATO has taken over the peacekeeping mission that works alongside American military operations in the country. It may emerge in Iraq if the United States can convince other states to send troops to the UN-authorized mission now under its command. What this book would predict, however, is that the NATO mission in Afghanistan will soon encounter political conflicts that undermine its efficacy, as interference from the various involved European capitals erupts over how force should be employed. The result, if Bosnia and Kosovo are any clue, is that mixed and confusing messages will be sent to the local population about what the international community intends. It would have been better for the United States to take on leadership of a Chapter Seven mission in Afghanistan from the start, with NATO country support rather than NATO command. This may emerge now in Iraq, although the hard face of American unilateralism throughout most of 2003 may undercut Washington's ability to gain diplomatic support for the kind of operation it now prefers to see waged.

A New Model of Security Building

There is no model for any kind of political behavior, including international intervention, that is perfect. There is also no model that will fit each new case to a tee. Any new model can be credibly critiqued by naysayers, as well as advocates of the current system who fear that change will leave things worse off. Certainly, each new peacekeeping case will demand flexibility in thinking, to respond to the details of the situation on the ground. But this book suggests that rather than lament the failures of peacekeeping as we now know it, it may be time to think of the problem in a new way.

A new model that I call security-keeping would give up the notion that political change can be forced on a foreign country, except perhaps in the rare circumstance of the aftermath of a total war like World War II. In this new model, the goal of military peacekeeping or occupation would no longer be to direct foreign countries along a path of liberalization or democratization. This model therefore stands in direct opposition to the thinking of the idealists in the current administration of George W. Bush,

those like Paul Wolfowitz (who some have called the "democratic imperialists") who believe that the United States can convince others to adopt its political system by using force to get rid of dictators.[17] The goal of this new model would furthermore not be to enforce the provisions of a treaty imposed on a society by outsiders, as in the Dayton Accords in Bosnia. It would not be to force ethnic integration on a recalcitrant society, as in Kosovo, or to right the wrongs of a past conflict. It is instead based on a fundamental belief that outsiders, no matter how well intentioned, cannot credibly force that kind of change on others. After the initial creation of a new government for a country, it would not attempt to control the direction of election and appointment results, as in the Balkans, or to favor a particular notion of government structure, as happened in East Timor.

Instead, the militarily supported peacekeeping mission would have one and only one overarching purpose: to provide security—along a country's borders, in support of humanitarian aid delivery, and for the purpose of establishing broad-scale public order—until a new indigenous government can take over those functions itself. The mission would be led by a state who has a strong interest in a stable outcome in the territory. That state would have military troops trained for flexible policing duties, and would reward soldiers and officers with promotion for good performance of such actions. The intervening lead state should furthermore be determined to stay the course until stability is achieved. State leaders must convey to their own public why providing stability to the foreign country in question is in the clear national interest. They must also communicate the expectation that casualties will occur in a difficult environment, and that the loss of soldiers, while regretted, will be accepted as inevitable.

As in the case of the Interfet mission in East Timor, the lead state would be responsible for choosing its partners in the operation, and of assigning the forces of all willing donors to tasks where they would be appropriately used. Some contributors would provide strong security for humanitarian aid delivery, border control, and government functioning; others would train new domestic security forces, or help rebuild roads, humane but secure prisons for violent opposition leaders, and electricity grids. The lead state would put its own continuing resources into helping select and train a domestic constabulary force for the target country—in other words, a force designed over a space of several years to replace the security functions served by the peacekeepers. The understanding going in would be that the peacekeeping force would remain in place until this new, domestic security force was capable of taking its place—and that this might mean making a commitment of many years. As we have learned in many recent peacekeeping operations, the domestic security force would have to be

supported by some form of functioning judicial system, as well, so that those arrested for committing violent acts were not simply released and put back on the street. This model works only when there is a clear security interest at stake in acting, since it requires high levels of political will. In other cases, where purely humanitarian goals are at stake, there may be no alternative to the disorderly current model of multilateral effort that we now use.

For all of its flaws, the example of Afghanistan may provide a good, if incomplete, picture of how this new model of security-keeping can be initially set up in conflict-ridden societies. The international community as a whole, as represented by the UN and a special representative of the UN Secretary General, can work with and encourage domestic factions to meet with each other and select a new government that the majority of those factions find (at a minimum) acceptable. Leadership in this state-creation endeavor may still have to come from interested states, as it did in the case of Afghanistan from the ongoing influence and pressure of the United States representative on the ground, Zalmay Khalilzad. The outcome, as in the case of the selection of President Karzai, will never be perfect. The selection process will always be controversial, and there will always be accusations that the process is rigged. Nonetheless the initial leadership of the new country will at least be seen to be supported from many directions, and will not be easily lampooned as a simple flunky of a single neoimperialist state. This was not done in Iraq; the United States did not seek multilateral support for the choices it made in appointing Iraq's interim governing council. This choice undoubtedly weakened the legitimacy of the new proto-government in the eyes of the Iraqi people.

Afghanistan also provides at least a rudimentary example of how the turnover of security functions to a new state can proceed. Training of an indigenous Afghan security force is moving forward, but its success has been limited because powerful factions in the country have not been willing to work with the new government. Here is where more determination and a wider deployment area by the initial peacekeeping force could have made a difference. If the international community's real goal was to provide stability in the country—something that is now becoming clearer, as the expansion of the peace force continues—then peacekeepers in Afghanistan, led by an American command and well armed and well protected, should have been deployed immediately throughout the country with the explicit statement that they were there to provide order on behalf of the new government. This should have happened even as other American soldiers continued their anti-al Qaeda mop-up activities.[18] Such an internationally mandated presence would have provided a visible reminder

to the population as a whole that the international community did not support recalcitrant warlords. Indeed, as time went on this system was adopted. For example, U.S. civil affairs troops made it clear that they would only provide humanitarian assistance—for example by helping build new water wells—to regional governors in Afghanistan who publicized the good works that Karzai was doing for their regions.[19] Early success in restoring order may also have attracted more Afghanis to work in the new domestic security forces, by making the central government appear stronger and more worthy of support.

As this book was going to press, the international community was given the opportunity to do this in Haiti the second time around. We can hope that a clear message will be communicated to the Haitian people: that international forces are in the country in order to provide support to the constitutionally formed government that replaces the departing Aristide regime. We can hope that this time around some interested state stays the course, to ensure that security is provided until the new government can create a functioning civil police system for itself. This time around, we can hope that the job is not left to an ad hoc collection of international police forces whose training and qualifications vary. While Pentagon forces were severely overextended because of continuing instability in Iraq and Afghanistan, a glimmer of hope was provided by the French presence in the initial UN-authorized intervention force in Haiti in March 2004. Perhaps this time around, the French gendarmerie can step in as the interim security force that the new Haitian government so badly needs.

The primary goal of peacekeeping in this model would then be to do what it takes to help this new government gain control over the country. That means paying special attention to the problems of border control, so that the circulation of weapons, rebels, and the contraband goods that fund them can be limited. It also means providing a presence throughout the territory of the new regime, so that everyone understands that the international community is watching what happens. Troops should expect to face rioters, and should have adequate equipment and training to allow them to protect themselves from such things as stones and bottle rockets without shooting into crowds in response. They should not have to withdraw in the face of such opposition, as the Americans initially did in Mitrovica. And until a new domestic security force is formed, this new model sees no realistic alternative to having foreign military forces provide a rudimentary justice system. It is impossible for an international military force to prevent or even investigate every post-conflict crime of looting or retribution, as was made clear in Haiti in 1994. It is also impossible for that force to end organized criminal activity on the territory, as we have learned

in Kosovo. But enough troops should be placed in major areas of tension to deter disruption by convincing the locals that violent criminal activity will not be tolerated. If the laws governing society are being set by local authorities in the capital, rather than by outsiders (who can be said not to understand the situation on the ground), it should be easier to gain popular support for the occupation authorities—even when, as on the 1990s peacekeeping missions in Haiti, Kosovo and East Timor—neither the methods of detective work nor the jails holding violators are ideal.

How would this model work in a country divided by ethnic hatred, as in Bosnia or Kosovo? The answer is that in this model, the international community would abandon the long-standing idea that it has the right to confer legitimate sovereign statehood on some territories but not others. In a society where a single state is impossible to hold together without the use of outside force, as Bosnia still appears to be and as Kosovo is likely to become, multiple regional authorities would be tolerated. A number of proposals have surfaced in recent years about alternatives to statehood for territories too small, too divided, or too economically weak to function as real states in the international system. Jeffrey Herbst has proposed this as a solution for state failure in sub-Saharan Africa,[20] and Chaim Kaufmann has explored the relatively taboo topic of partition in the Balkans.[21] The idea of partition has even been raised, along with a great deal of controversy, by Leslie Gelb as a potential future for Iraq.[22] More thought should be put toward the question of how territorial self-determination might exist in areas that are too small to have the full trappings of statehood, such as independent economic sovereignty. Especially in an era when supra-state structures like the European Union are coming into their own, it is time for the international community to think outside of the current box that says that states *per se* have unique juridical rights that they can in turn extend to others. In the Balkans, in this model, the goal of security-keeping would be to stop people from killing each other, not to force them to live together in ethnic harmony. The international community needs to recognize that liberal democratic paternalism is not a long-term solution to the continuing existence of illiberal beliefs.

This doesn't mean that the United Nations wouldn't still be involved in questions of humanitarian assistance, economic development, elections monitoring, or political and judicial reform. There would certainly still need to be cooperation between civilian and military agencies in coordinating the disbursal of assistance, and in making the transition from international security provision to the creation of functioning domestic security forces. The initial setting up of a government, whether by election as in Cambodia or Haiti, or by council as in Afghanistan, would still be encour-

aged and overseen by the international community acting as a whole. The training of new domestic security forces would also need to be supported by an international civilian police presence, and not just by military officers. But beyond that initial effort, political reforms would be suggested, rather than mandated, by outsiders. The goal of security-keeping would be to prevent and prosecute violence to forestall the possibility of anarchy, not to achieve liberal political outcomes.

If we lived in a world where the political will of liberal democratic states to intervene abroad with coherence were abundant, it would not be necessary to put these kinds of limits on the goals of peacekeeping operations. It is not that there is anything wrong with the desire by liberal democracies to share their philosophical political visions with others. That ideal world, however, does not exist. By focusing on doing one thing—security keeping—that is central to the self-interests of the international community, and doing it well, peacekeepers would have a much better chance of actually establishing longstanding peace and stability in the troubled areas of the world where they are deployed.

How would this ideal model differ from the examples of complex military peacekeeping discussed in this book? Unlike the case of intervention in Haiti in 1994, there would be more effort made to actively restore public order and establish faith in the new government, not just to ensure that elections occur and then turn order over to local chance. There would have to be more of a commitment to stay for a longer term. But unlike the peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo, there would be no attempt by outsiders to impose a particular political outcome on the country, beyond cementing the authority of leaders (and in these cases, this might mean several regional leaders) who were minimally acceptable to both the international community and a variety of domestic factions. If the territory in question had a tendency anchored in a long history of animosity to divide itself along ethnic lines, division would be allowed by the international community. The presence of well armed and well protected troops would be used to encourage such a partition to happen as peacefully and with as little bloodshed as possible, and those troops would stay until there was a reasonable guarantee that the remaining minority groups could expect to be physically protected by whatever new government emerged in their area. In other words, unlike the example of IFOR in Sarajevo, well armed troops would not stand by as city districts were set ablaze by separatist forces. Muslim enclaves in the Serbian region of Bosnia would still be protected, as would Serbian enclaves in Kosovo. But unlike the examples of SFOR and KFOR, the international community would not actively encourage or induce the return of displaced minorities to geographic areas

where they had no reasonable chance of being welcomed in the next generation, and would not force a particular constitution on any territory.

In Haiti in 1994, as well as in Bosnia and Kosovo, there was a misplaced hope that international civilian police forces would be able to provide public order. They did not arrive in sufficient time or with sufficient training or desire to do so. Unlike those cases, in this new model there would no longer be an expectation that UN police could fill the security gap. Instead, flexibly trained and deployed military troops would be willing to deal with whatever situation came their way, and would go in with the understanding that they would stay as long as was necessary. Perhaps, if a sufficient number of troops were available, this could be done by American military police or the French gendarmerie. We will see if this is indeed what happens in Haiti the second time around, as the 2004 intervention gives way to a follow-on police force. But if sufficient specialized troops are not available, regular combat forces will have to learn to be peacekeepers, too. East Timor provides perhaps the best existing example of a case where this latter kind of policy has worked. Yet the abrupt departure of most of the international community may have put the long-term success of that case in jeopardy. As this book was going to press, the UN was intending to leave the country entirely by May 2004, even as the new Malaysian commander of the UN peacekeeping force there expressed continuing concern about both cross-border raids from former militia members and internal clashes between clans in East Timor itself in a situation of economic despair.[23] In this new model, an end-state of stable security replaces an artificial end-date set in advance, as the measure of operational success.

Future Interventions

This new model of security-keeping cannot provide a solution to the dire problem of the lack of political will to respond to humanitarian crises. It will not prevent future Rwandas from happening, and it cannot speed the reaction of even self-interested countries to the kinds of tragedies that engulfed Haiti, Bosnia, and East Timor in the 1990s. Perhaps, though, if the idea becomes ingrained that the purpose of the international community is only to supply security until new regimes can do it for themselves, and not to engender lasting liberal-democratic political change, it will be easier to gain both popular and military support for such missions. Especially if a stronger link can be made in the public mind between anarchy and the opportunity for terrorism to flourish, intervention to overcome anarchic violence will become more acceptable and politically popular.

This new model is by definition flawed and incomplete. It does not answer the question of how the international community should deal with war crimes, for example. It does not provide a template of how to stop retribution killings in post-conflict situations, nor does it explain how a reliable new security force can be formed from the ruins of a police state. But despite these gaps, it may help generate a new way of looking at the problem of peacekeeping.

The comparison of recent peacekeeping operations to the era of colonialism as practiced by liberal democratic states has highlighted the fact that imposing control over a foreign society is not possible using liberal democratic means. No matter how noble our intentions, we face limitations in our capabilities and in the effects that our actions can have. In places like Bosnia and Kosovo, the international community has spent enormous resources in trying to create liberal societies; yet the fact remains that occupation is the only thing that guarantees their functioning. In places like Haiti, a large expenditure of resources in the end created no change, and a decade later the international community was called back in again. The people were replaced, but the system was not. Instead of trying to change societies, we should change our expectations. A return to the goal of keeping the peace, rather than imposing change, will lead to more realistic policies that have a better chance of reaching their goals.