<u>NATO AND PEACEKEEPING</u>

Robert J. Jackson

Visiting Fellow Centre for International Studies                    and Clare Hall, University of Cambridge
Final Report for NATO Fellowship, Due 30 June 1997.

NATO AND PEACEKEEPING  by Robert J. Jackson

Synopsis

Many serious observers, including very senior United Nations officials, have argued for several years that NATO and peacekeeping were incompatible. One even asserted that NATO and peacekeeping go together like "oil and water". This paper assesses the role that NATO has played in Bosnia-Herzegovina and concludes that NATO has not only become a "new" organization but that, in successfully carrying out a peacekeeping role, it has enhanced its importance as the most significant organization in the European security architecture.

Using "neo-institutional" definitions, the paper outlines how the "new" NATO has evolved, assesses the concepts used in the analysis of peacekeeping, and examines in detail NATO's activities in the former Yugoslavia since 1991. The paper finds that NATO has performed its role in managing IFOR and now SFOR with dispatch and effectiveness, and concludes that if any criticisms are to be levelled at the international community's activities in Bosnia-Herzegovina they are more rightly aimed at other international organizations than at the Alliance. Any preparations for an "exit strategy" should bear these conclusions in mind.

*******************

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dismantlement of the USSR, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has undergone such a profound transformation that it has, for all intents and purposes, become a new organization. NATO has not merely adjusted to its new circumstances; it has gone through a complete process of metamorphosis.

One can conceive of an institution in two ways. A purposive definition would be something such as: an institution is a social structure organized to achieve some specified goal or goals. But institutions also arise, grow and develop in much less purposive ways. In this latter case they can be thought of as "congealed tastes" or conventions about values that are condensed into organizations or institutions. The former definition is often useful for understanding the origin of new institutions, while the latter may be more accurate of institutions which emerge, grow and develop over time. Moreover, many institutions originate out of such a confused set of competing ideas and desires that their precise purposes or objectives are not at all clear. Moreover, many institutions are devoted to such diffuse idealistic and romantic goals that the relation between

their activities and goals is tenuous, to say the least.[1]

<u>The New NATO: Structure, Purpose and Membership</u>

An institution or an organization is characterized by three factors - its structure, purpose or goals and membership. These three factors together describe what the organization is. Scholars cannot describe an organization by its declared intention - otherwise, according to its constitution, the USSR would have been known as one of the most just and honourable countries on earth and Canada today would be ruled by Queen Elizabeth II. Whatever its declared intentions, NATO has acted in such a way that we can say that a new organization has emerged. Of course, the declared intent expressed most clearly in article 5 (and not revoked) is the collective defense of its members. But by its action NATO has moved closer to a collective security organization for Europe and possibly beyond. It has indicated this most clearly with its first actions "out of area", in the former Yugoslavia. As in any organization, though perhaps unwittingly, NATO leaders have analyzed their institution's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and made a strategic leap to a novel arrangement of structure, purpose and membership.

First, NATO's "organization" began to change following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. This happened through a unique process of adjustment and compromise on the part of the major players - the USA,

---

[1] See Robert J. Jackson and Doreen Jackson, <u>Comparative Government</u> (Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1997). For detailed summaries of the "neo-institutional" approach see James March and Johan Olsen, "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life", <u>APSR</u> (vol.78 (1984); Walter W. Powell and Paul J. Dimaggio, eds., <u>The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis</u> (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); R. Kurt Weaver and Bert A. Rockman, eds., <u>Do Institutions Matter?</u> (Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1993).

Britain, France and Germany. The changed position of these four countries, and perhaps others, was no doubt induced by the end of the Soviet threat and the emergence of democratic leadership in Russia. But it was also affected by issues of western financial constraint, events in the Gulf and the former Yugoslavia, and the political configurations of the major NATO partners. The 1996 Berlin Communique is probably the clearest illustration of this commitment to a new structure.

The Berlin Communique gave credence to idea of establishing a European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) inside NATO. As well, it further developed the concept of the Combined Joint Tasks Forces (CJTFs), and its new "mood" has led to increased flexibility for more cooperative arrangements with France and Partnership for Peace countries.[2]

Second, NATO's "purpose, or "objective" began to change with its first-ever violent use of air and naval forces to back up UN peacekeepers in Bosnia-Herzegovina, its first-ever ground force operation in IFOR and now SFOR, and its first-ever joint operation with Partnership for Peace and other non-NATO countries. As an existentialist might say, an institution's philosophy or purpose is shown not by what it says but by what it does.

Third, NATO's membership is on the verge of shifting eastward to include countries of central and eastern Europe. I will come back to this debate, but my contention in these opening remarks is only to argue that this extension of membership will put the final touches on the new NATO. It will complete the transformation.

Alliances

---

[2] North Atlantic Council Communique, Berlin 3 June 1996 in NATO Review (July 1996),pp.30-35.For details see S.N. Drew,"From Berlin to Bosnia: NATO in Transition, 1989-1994" in C. Berry(ed)Reforging the Transatlantic Relationship(Washington: NDU Press, 1996).

Classical international relations specialists and many journalists spend far too much energy examining the declared intentions of leaders of international organizations and even their formal, legalistic charters. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the argument put forward by some commentators today that since NATO is an "alliance" it must be aimed at a particular threat or common enemy - namely, Russia. On the contrary, it is not such efforts at conceptual clarity that provide the energy for a metamorphosis from one type of institution to the next but the internal and external dynamics of institutions. An organization should be understood in the context of the way it acts.

Such scholars would do far better to assess what organizations actually do and how they evolve if they wish to understand institutions such as NATO. Obviously such reasoning about the need for a precise threat is conditioned more by the logic of "creationism" than it is by "Darwinian evolution". Out of something venerable and old, and with little understanding by its participants, can come something new. We might even say that because of its fundamental transformation NATO should have a new name -- it would be a rose by any other name, so to speak. A 'new' NATO will have emerged from the one whose purpose was to defend the West against the Soviet Union.

Eventually it could even adopt a new name but that is several years ahead of us.


NATO and Peacekeeping


Military force and statecraft have always been intertwined in foreign policy, but never have the principles for their choice or use been so much in debate as today. Our project here is to describe and analyze a central issue in the debate about the new NATO - policy-making toward issues concerning peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace enforcement in the former Yugoslavia. But this should not deter us from carefully examining the other issues of organizational structure and enlargement which also are central to the new NATO.

The post-Cold War has seen the emergence of a multiplicity of security organizations with overlapping jurisdictions and imprecisely defined mandates. Among these, NATO has stood out. The UN and OSCE may have greater legitimacy and the wider mandates, but only NATO has military forces at its

command with  control, communications structures, intelligence, lift capability, strategic plans and the ability to act in a crisis. Even at the conceptual level, where the United Nations became entangled and confused over peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peace enforcement, NATO has shown that concepts and ideas should not just be bandied about but need to be relate to action on the ground.

Institutional Structure.

*Background*: NATO's institutional history is complex and recent organizational changes must be put in the context of the evolution of NATO from the 1991 Rome Summit and the development of the "New Strategic Concept". The move to more structural flexibility and a broader approach to security helped to make other policies more possible, especially involvement in the former Yugoslavia. This early evolution also facilitated the activities and successes of NACC and the Partnership for Peace, and made possible a multinational force of both east and west in IFOR and SFOR. Eventually, the IFOR/SFOR experience will lead to even greater cooperation been NATO members and partnership countries and enhance NATO-Russian dialogue.

- *The 1996 NATO Communique*: The 1996 Berlin Communique gives expression to what has been developing inside NATO since it began to act in the former Yugoslavia. It gives credence to NATO's adaptability. A new NATO structure is emerging. At the June 1996 Berlin meeting the idea of establishing the European Security and Defence Identity(ESDI) was accepted. The most concrete result has been the further development of the Combined Joint Tasks Forces (CJTFs), but the increased flexibility has also led to more cooperative arrangements with France and Partnership for Peace countries.[3]

   The processes or at least attitudinal shifts that are leading to new structural arrangement can be summarized as follows:

- *The United States:* agrees to the development of a degree of European "identity" inside NATO. While this does not constitute acceptance of an unrestrained two-pillar concept (or dumbbell, as Canadians call it) it does

---

[3] North Atlantic Council Communique, Berlin 3 June 1996 in NATO Review (July 1996), pp. 30-35. For details see Partnership in Crisis: United States, Europe and the Fall and Rise of NATO (London: Cassells, 1997) by Paul Cornish, and S.N. Drew,"From Berlin to Bosnia: NATO in Transition, 1989-1994" in C. Berry (ed) Reforging the Transatlantic Relationship (Washington: NDU Press, 1996).

appear to be a shift in US foreign policy thinking.

- *The United Kingdom:* agrees that the development of a European "identity" inside NATO does not compromise Atlanticism or Britain's strong commitment to the importance of American and Canadian significance inside the Alliance.

- *France:* while there have been some setbacks lately (especially over France's recent demand that a European share command of the southern region based in Naples) French leaders appear more and more ready to rejoin NATO. President Chirac made the first move by announcing in December 1995 that France would reintegrate completely with NATO if it became sufficiently "Europeanized" and was shaping its policies for the period after the Cold War. Since then, France has given dramatic signs of informal cooperation and indicated that it is prepared to act as a full participant, and not simply as an observer, in the military committee. In all, France appears to have dropped its zero-sum view of NATO versus the WEU. It also appears to wish to avoid being assimilated inside a uniquely European military alliance as envisaged by "assimilationist" proponents of a European Union model of foreign and defense policy-making.[4] Following the debates about the European Union one might say that its view has been more "inter-governmental" than integrationist or federalist.

---

[4] Background: General de Gaulle pulled France out of the NATO integrated military command in 1966; American officers automatically hold NATO's Supreme military command as well as the naval commands of the Atlantic and Mediterranean. The southern command's most important asset is the US Sixth Fleet and American aircraft based in Italy. There is no possibility that the USA will give up command of these assets. Europeans hold the position of Deputy Supreme Commander.

- *Germany:* continues to see no inconsistency with its pragmatic position that the European Union can move toward further integration of foreign and defense policy while continuing to argue that NATO should remain the primary defender of Europe's security. As a side-effect, of course, this also makes France consider that the USA may not be so bad after all. Germany has also shifted its overall policies towards peacekeeping.[5]

Institutional Purpose/Objective.

Background: The Cold War provided a cover for much of the domestic plight and hatred in the world. It held a kind of umbrella over domestic and intra-state conflict. It was a period of high threat and high stability. The new world is now more open and democratic, but its characterization has changed to low threat and high instability.

---

[5] Germany has slowly entered the peacekeeping game. The steps included sending a logistical unit with the multinational force to Somalia; in 1994 the Constitutional Court ruled that it was legal for the Bundeswehr to deploy outside of Germany if such deployments were multinational and approved by parliament; in 1996 Germany deployed 4000 troops with IFOR in Bosnia but had them in Croatia to perform support roles such as logistics and a hospital; in 1997 Germany deployed 3000 troops to Bosnia, including the first combat-ready troops the country has sent abroad since the Second World War.

Since the end of the Cold War, during the so-called Hot Peace, there have been more than five and a half million people killed in 93 wars involving 70 states.[6] The United Nations has proved incapable of decisive action in Somalia, Rwanda and elsewhere in Africa. The policy-making of the European Union, WEU, and the OSCE has proved incoherent in providing solutions to the tragedy in the former Yugoslavia. While thwarted for the moment, turmoil in Albania to be heading in the same direction.


NATO, the United Nations and the Concept of Peacekeeping

---

[6] These are the numbers for the period 1990-1995. Data on war deaths is, of course, very unreliable. But these numbers come from Dan Smith, The State of War and Peace Atlas (London: Penguin, 1997).For a comparison, however, Hugh Miall has calculated that since 1945 there have been over 150 armed conflicts with an estimated 25-30 million deaths, excluding famine and disease, and *I. Kende has concluded that there have only been* 26 days without war. See Hugh Miall, The Peacemakers(London: Macmillan,1992)and I.Kende "Local Wars since 1945", in E. Laszlo and J. Y. Yoo, eds., World Encyclopedia of Peace( New York: Pergamon,1986).

It should be remembered that the United Nations Charter does not actually authorize any of the forms of what is today called "peacekeeping". The first so-called peacekeeping operation can, however, be traced to the UN Supervision Organization (UNTSO) in Palestine in June 1948. Today's form of peacekeeping was first witnessed in the Middle East when a UN Emergency Force (UNEF) was established to replace British, French and Israeli forces in the Canal Zone and Sinai after the so-called Suez fiasco in 1956. This face-saving strategy proved to be the first time an armed peacekeeping force was deployed with blue helmets.[7]

While NATO took no actions as such in these or any of the  large number of UN peacekeeping operations which followed over the next four decades, many members of the organization were instrumental in developing the concepts, methods, operations and outcomes of these operations. Although some of these "peacekeeping" operations came only weakly under chapter VII of the UN Charter which allowed "Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression", no specific changes to the Charter were made to accommodate to this new form of UN behaviour. While the fathers of the UN had in mind interstate threats to the peace when they drafted Chapter VII, the UN interpretation seems more and more to be about using the clause for peacekeeping and even peace enforcement for weak or failed states, or even internal wars and succession movements.[8]

Peacekeeping, therefore, has come to mean many different kinds of operations as it is associated with peace within states and  peace among states. Conceptual confusion reigns. The early understanding of the

---

[7]See Anthony Parsons, From Cold War to Hot Peace: UN Interventions 1947-1994 (London: Michael Joseph, 1995).

[8]See Kalevi J. Holsti, The State, War, and the State of War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

principles was that peacekeeping should 1) not be confused with enforcement actions; 2) be acceptable to the belligerents (ie. consent was required); 3) be impartial; 4) and be temporary in nature. In Bosnia the United Nations violated all of these principles, teetering between the various forms of peacekeeping and often appearing uncertain about what action to take.

Among those interested in clarifying the terminological confusion, "traditional" peacekeeping came to mean UN actions in creating the conditions for diplomacy to work. This included monitoring ceasefires and controlling zones of separation between belligerents. (Cyprus provides the classic example). But what has been called "wider" peacekeeping includes actions which follow a peace settlement by expanding the work of the UN troops to include demobilizing troops, the cantonment of weapons, training militaries and police, providing humanitarian relief (and using military intervention to ensure it) monitoring human rights, and conducting elections (Cambodia, Bosnia and Somalia provide recent examples of this wider use of peacemakers). But peacekeeping is also used for even more specific actions which should probably be called "peace enforcement", or the forcible action of the UN to separate warring factions and to restore peace with or without their consent (an example was Somalia, 1992 which was authorized by the UN but kept the military under national command).

The wars of the former Yugoslavia required the UN and finally NATO to be involved in all these types of actions. With little attention to principle, the UN shifted its position on "peacekeeping" depending on the current events from one form of peacekeeping to the next and NATO eventually was involved in all of them. Against the traditional principles of sovereignty and non-interference in the domestic affairs of countries the UN has begun acting inside divided, weak and failed states. Examples include the UN's creation of a no-fly zone over Iraq and eventually Bosnia, as well as so-called "safe-zones" for civilians in Bosnia and a "preventive" force in Macedonia.

*Bosnia-Herzegovina (B-H)*: The complexity of NATO's involvement in Bosnia-Herzegovina is mind-boggling. Synthesizing and coming to grips with the details of NATO's leadership of both Allies and Partners in the first real action of NATO in 47 years is both challenging and frustrating. A complete history of NATO involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina would have to begin back with the chain of disastrous domestic politics which led up to the signing of the Dayton Peace Accord as well as the subsequent deployment of the multinational IFOR and SFOR.[9]

In order to understand the eventual UN - NATO activities in Bosnia-Herzogovina it is necessary to understand two distinct sets of facts; events in the whole of the former Yugoslavia and events inside B-H itself. The first events consisted of efforts of the leaders of the new political entities to escape from Yugoslavian tutelage and the latter events of efforts to avoiding a civil war in the multi-ethnic state of B-H which consisted of 43% Muslims, 25% Croats, and 32% Serbs.

Efforts to keep the former communist regime of Yugoslavia united by peaceful and military means began to fall apart in the early 1990s with the election of governments in Croatia and Slovenia. In Bosnia-Herzegovina democratic elections were also held in 1990 which resulted in the setting up of a coalition government of Muslims, Serbs and Croatians led by President Izetbegovic. It proclaimed its independence from Yugoslavia on March 3, 1992. Hostile opposition to independence came from the Serb and Croatian minorities. Fighting in several areas finally led to the Bosnian civil war, the longest and most violent European war in the second half of the twentieth century, and to the deployment of the first UN peacekeepers in the former Yugoslavia. In February 1992, the UN established four protected areas in Croatia and sent a UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to carry out these responsibilites under SCR 743.

---

[9] The literature on this history is already immense. See for example, John M. Fraser, "Bosnian and other Balkan Powder Kegs",in Maureen Appel Molot and Harald von Riekhoff, ed., A Part of the Peace(Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1994),pp.301-322.

Hostilities among the Bosnians was further provoked when B-H was given international recognition in April 1992. Generally, the Muslims preferred this new multi-ethnic state while the Serbs preferred union with Serbia and the Croats with Croatia. War broke out among the groups, with Croatian, Serbian and military forces from B-H all involved to various degrees. Before the civil war ended, murders, rapes, and "ethnic cleaning" added to the brutality and inhumanity of the war itself. In September 1992, UNPROFOR II was set up to protect aid convoys and assist in humanitarian activities in B-H.

A Concise History of NATO Involvement in Bosnia

NATO's involvement in Bosnia began as early as 1992 and, despite claims to the contrary, will, in one form or another, continue past the date of writing this report. The following summary is not intended to be a history of the crisis or the UN involvement in the former Yugoslavia but purports to describe only the salient NATO activities in the field. The main picture is clear - the civil war in B-H intensified and there was a steady and successful increase in the use of NATO military hardware and personnel for over half a decade.[10] I use the definition of war employed by Hedley Bull - "War is organized violence carried out by political units against each other". Please note that this definition does not restrict the word war to only intra-state activity.

NATO in Bosnia in 1992

The earliest stages of NATO involvement in the former Yugoslavia included both air and maritimes forces. Both operations proved successful and led to a widespread appreciation of NATO's ability to cooperate with the United Nations. To a large extent it was this almost universal appreciation which led to the eventual setting up of NATO-led military forces to monitor the final Peace Agreement in B-H.

In October 1992, NATO AWACS aircraft began monitoring the no-fly zone over Bosnia and reported

---

[10]Hedley Bull, The Anarchical Society (NY: Columbia University Press, 1977), p,184.

any movements to UN authorities under UNSCR 781. In strategic terms this small part was not very important, but the success of the narrow mission led to further calls on NATO aircraft at later stages, as for example when the no-fly zone was expanded to cover all flights by fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft in the early months of the next year. NATO, too, was pleased with its limited but significant role, and in December 1992 NATO foreign ministers first stated that NATO was prepared to support peacekeeping operations acting under the authority of the UN Security Council.

By the end of air operations with the conclusion of the Peace Settlement in 1996, almost 100,000 sorties had been flown from Italy and aircraft carriers. And, possibly more significantly, on 28 February 1994 four airplanes violating the fly-zone were shot down by NATO planes in the first military engagement ever undertaken by the Alliance. This action proved significant both in encouraging NATO authorities and in making it clear (if this still needed to be explained) that NATO had vast superiority in air power.

NATO's second, less violent but more substantive, early involvement in the former Yugoslavia came with the use of maritime and air operations to monitor and finally enforce the UN arms embargo against all republics of the former Yugoslavia and sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in the Adriatic. NATO and WEU forces in the Adriatic operated together under a single command in Operation Sharp Guard to challenge, inspect and divert up to 74,000 ships before the embargo was lifted. According to NATO data "no ship" was able to break the embargo.[11] On 18 June 1996, enforcement operations of Sharp Guard (but not the operation itself) were suspended when the Dayton Peace Agreement was initialed. The operation was finally ended on October 1 1996, after the election requirement of the Dayton Peace Agreement was met as required to terminate the United Nations sanctions against Yugoslavia.

NATO in Bosnia in 1993

---

[11]NATO Fact Sheet, no. 4, 3.

In May 1993 the UN designated Srebrenica, Zepa, Gorazde, Tuzla, Sarajevo and Bihac as "safe areas" even though all of them were indefensible, and on June 4, UNSCR 836 gave UNPROFOR responsibility to defend them. The NATO Council concurred, agreeing to use air strikes to help these "safe areas". Close airsupport was provided by NATO aircraft to UN troops in Gorazde (April 1993) and Srebrenica (July 1995), but despite NATO assistance both Srebrenica and Zepa fell to the Bosnian Serbs.

NATO in Bosnia in 1994

In early 1994 the UN succeeded in negotiating a cease-fire in Sarajevo: all heavy weapons were were to be placed in collection areas or pulled back a specified distance from the city. NATO was instructed to enforce this agreement. On 9 February and 22 April, under instructions from the UN, NATO authorized air strikes against artillery and mortar positions in and around Sarejevo, Gorazde and other "safe areas". Belligerents were warned to withdraw all heavy weapons from a 20-kilometre exclusion zone around Sarajevo or placed them in UNPROFOR control within ten days. The same warning was given for Gorazde with strikes to take place any time after April 27th. The other four "safe areas" - Bihac, Srebrenica, Tuzla, and Zepa - were to be protected if they were attacked by heavy weapons from any range. These threats did not work.

NATO began to act, not just threaten to act. Following UNPROFOR advice, the following NATO air operations proceeded quickly:

a) 5 August, attack on a target in the Sarejevo exclusion zone after weapons were seized by Bosnian Serb forces.

b) 22 September, attack on a Bosnian Serb tank in retaliation for attack on an UNPROFOR vehicle.

c) 21 November attack on Udbina air-field in Serb-held Croatia in response to attacks launched from that airfield against target in Bihac.

d)23 November, attacks on air defense radars in area of Otoka in retaliation for surface-to-air missile attack on NATO aircraft.

NATO in Bosnia in 1995

The next year there was little improvement on the ground and the international media spotlighted each worsening episode. This media greatly influenced western publics, convincing them that more decisive action

had to be taken. Despite Serbian protests on the 25 and 26 May, NATO attacked Bosnian Serb ammunition depots in Pale. Bosnian Serbs reacted by direct aggression against UN peacekeepers. They neutralized the threat of continued NATO air strikes by taking 370 UN hostages to be used as human shields. Canadian Captain Patrick Rechner was filmed chained to a a lamp post at a Bosnian Serb ammunition depot causing international outcries. After considerable diplomacy, threats and media commentary the hostages were finally all released by 18th May.

The inability of the UN to protect the safe areas and the peacekeepers caused further dramatic action. A UN Rapid Reaction Force was announced even though it was not at all clear what its mission would be. NATO air attacks continued: on 4 August, NATO bombed Croatian air defense radars near Udbina and Knin.

The success, or lack thereof, of Serbian, Croatian and Muslim armed forces became totally entwined with the activities of the UN and NATO. It was difficult to separate belligerents from peacekeepers. The decisive events of the hostilities began in August following a mortar attack on Sarajevo by Bosnian Serbs in which 38 people were killed. NATO conducted a three-week campaign of air strikes against Bosnian Serb targets: mortars, ammunition dumps, anti-aircraft gun and missile sites were targeted. This action, termed Deliberate Force and authorized by UN Resolution 836, was terminated on 3 September. These miliary actions were much more than traditional peacekeeping. They were more purposive - in the order of forcing an end to the conflict by destroying Serb equipment and morale. These actions were, in fact, peace enforcement activities, or even might even be called "limited war" because despite the fact that the war was carried on under the UN auspices it was still a war with the limited aim of bringing the war between the belligerents to a close. (Whether or not the UN or NATO declared it a limited war, it was indeed a war - as Christopher Bellamy bluntly put it, "The Serbs did not consent to being bombed."[12])

On September 10, NATO launched 13 Tomahawk cruise missiles at Serb air defenses near Banja Luka. By the time these operation were terminated on September 20, 3,400 NATO sorties had been flown and the Serbs had been severely damaged. In their fight with the Croats, the Serbs were denied their air defense network, communications systems and even the telephone. Even after the operation was supposed to be over NATO aircraft fired three missiles at Bosnian Serb radar sites after anti-aircraft radar had locked unto them.

---

[12] Christopher Bellamy, Knights in White Armour (London: Random House, 1996), p.174. Emphasis added by the author.

IFOR

Implementation Force (IFOR): The first phase of NATO control in Bosnia began with UN Security Council Resolution 1031 which authorized member states to establish a multinational military force to implement the Dayton Peace Agreement (the formal agreement - General Framework for Peace - was signed by Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in Paris on 14 December 1995).

This so-called Dayton Peace Agreement led to NATO's Operation Joint Endeavour and the Implementation Force (IFOR) to put in place the military aspects of the Dayton agreement. On 16 December 1996, the deployment of 60,000 troops (50,000 NATO and 10,000 non-NATO) and equipment from 32 states began under UNSCR 1031, allowed under Chapter VII (the peace enforcement clause) of the UN Charter. The deployment of these troops took 2,800 airlift missions and more than 50 cargo ships.[13] The rules of engagement called for the robust use of force by IFOR, if necessary, to carry out its mission and protect itself.

IFOR's tasks were to ensure compliance with Annex 1-A of the Agreement which constituted the military portion of the agreement. Summarized these clauses instruct IFOR to -

1. maintain cessation of hostilities;

2.separate the armed forces of the Bosnian-Croat Federation and the Republika Srpska;

3.transfer territory between the two entities;

4.move the forces and heavy weapons into authorized cantonment sites;

5.create a secure environment for civil aspects of the agreement; and

6.control airspace over B-H.

---

[13]SFOR Fact Sheet, 19 February 1997, p.3.

By February 1996 all forces were withdrawn from the zone of separation on either side of the agreed cease-fire line and in March a new zone of separation was established along a so-called inter-entity boundary line. By April the final stages in the military agreement concerning cantonment of heavy weapons was completed and the peace plan was in full operation.

Within one year IFOR made substantial progress in its responsibilities in Bosnia. No significant military activity occurred after its arrival. Joint Military Commissions were developed, air defense radar was shut down, hostile forces withdrew from the zone of separation, most heavy weapons and non-demobilized forces were moved to barracks or designated areas. Significant difficulties remained in the fields of: freedom of movement (not for IFOR but for regular citizens); prisoner release; and some foreign forces remained in the theatre. More ominous were the civil issues involving political, social and economic problems which remained unresolved. The most outstanding problem left after IFOR completed its responsibilities concerned democratic elections. Even when, on 14 September 1996, nation-wide "entity" elections took place, municipal elections still had to be postponed.

In total, and certainly by comparison with the civilian responsibilities of the Dayton Peace Agreement, IFOR was immensely successful in its primary functions and left the field to its successor as an outstanding success. Its mandate ended on December 10, 1996 and was immediately taken up by a Stabilization Force (SFOR) which was appointed by the UNSC in resolution 1088.


SFOR


Stabilization Force (SFOR): As of today (June 15,1997) there are about 32,000 SFOR troops deployed in Bosnia with contributions from all NATO countries and 18 non-NATO countries. This operation, Joint Guard, began on December 20, 1996 under Security Council Resolution 1088 (1996) and is to last eighteen months or until June 1998. Despite a smaller contingent than its predecessor, SFOR has the same mandate and mission, especially to ensure respect for the cessation of hostilities and the zone of separation. As well as maintaining control of airspace and movement of military traffic, SFOR personnel staff the Joint Military Commissions, support international organizations, assist in finding solutions for refugees and displaced persons, respond to violence and assist in the clearance of minefields and obstacles to civilian reconstruction.

SFOR is roughly half the size of IFOR with essentially the same responsibilities. It consists of 34 participating countries. Sixteen NATO countries, 18 non-NATO countries (14 in the PFP program - Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia, Sweden and Ukraine; and four others - Egypt, Jordan, Malaysia and Morocco).

SFOR Military Organization and Responsibilities

All forces in Bosnia operate under one chain of military command. In order to ensure overall control but also allow individual country input, the non-NATO countries take their orders from the SFOR commander through the multinational divisional commanders and the liaison officers at SHAPE and IFOR headquarters in Sarajevo. Political consultations take place in Brussels.

Funding for Bosnian operations is paid partially by NATO and partially by the participating countries: Non-NATO counties are responsible for their own individual costs, and common-funded programmes are paid for by NATO.

As with IFOR, the responsibility of the new force is to keep the peace among the parties in order to allow the civil international organizations time to build up political, economic and social institutions which, in theory, will maintain stability in the area after the troops have departed. More specifically, during its few months in the field, SFOR has conducted compliance inspections, confiscated and destroyed unauthorized weapons. SFOR has also dismantled illegal checkpoints which continue to be placed in and around the zone of separation.

Low level violence continues throughout B-H, especially in Mostar and in the villages in and around the zone of separation. In the first half year of SFOR deployment there have been several violent incidents over displaced persons trying to return to their homes, and houses have been destroyed by arson and explosion. Demining is not complete and both Bosniac and Bosnian Serb parties are still non-compliant in the mandatory return of prisoners.

Despite efforts of SFOR, the International Police Task Force (IPTF) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), resettlement is not going smoothly. Freedom of movement remains a major problem. Examples abound. On 31 January 1997, for example, SFOR, IPTF, and

UNHCR tried to help nine Bosniac families return from Stolac to Mostar. The operation was called off when the convoy was attacked with rocks and eggs thrown by Bosnian Croat women and children.

SFOR is also active in helping the OSCE with its preparations for municipal elections which are re-scheduled for September 13-14, 1997 after being postponed last year. SFOR support for civilian organizations is also significant. The Combined Joint Civil Military Co-operation links SFOR to the various other organizations (Office of the High Representative, OSCE, World Bank, and NGOs) in projects concerning electric power, coal, natural gas, roads and bridges, telecommunications, water, police forces, public health, refugees and displaced persons.

Operations Today

The history of NATO's first deployment of ground forces outside its traditional area of operations has been extremely significant in the metamorphosis of NATO. The results to date clearly indicate major accomplishments for NATO in carrying out its specific military goals and objectives. Continued success is vital if Bosnia and Herzogevina are to move closer to a state of permanent peace, justice, tolerance and reconciliation as envisaged in the Dayton Accord. Without the presence of SFOR the hope for achieving peace enforcement, reconstruction and civilian transformation is extremely unlikely.

There are, however, many elements in the Dayton Accord which, while aimed at preventing the resumption of fighting, are also potentially volatile. For example, while the "arms restraint regime" does prepare for a build-down of armed forces, it also calls for the creation of a new "balance of power" in the area. NATO has carefully circumscribed its comments, however, by declaring that it does not have responsibility for "nation building" which is defined as including: the conduct of humanitarian missions; maintaining election security; police force duties; moving refugees; and implementing arms control and regional stability

measures.[14]

---

[14]NATO/SFOR Fact Sheet, December 20,1996.

Difficulties in non-NATO controlled jurisdictions of the Dayton agreement are legion. The major issues which SFOR cannot greatly affect include the complex constitutional structure of the new state, the configuration of parties, voting behaviour in the first general elections, the lack of mobility of movement and resettlement of refugees, massive economic dislocation and ruin (there has been constant delay in the drafting of economic laws), slow progress on getting an IMF agreement, hostile issues over displaced persons, and significant violence especially in Mostar and villages around the zone of separation. Thus, while the future state of Bosnia and Herzegovina is problematic as even today not all compliance requirements of the Dayton Accord are being met, NATO has carried out its role there with courage and dispatch.[15]

Relations with International Organizations

NATO's involvement in Bosnia has involved complex relationships with a multitude of international agencies.

---

[15]One of the most illuminating statements on Dayton and the peace process was by Carl Bildt, the High Representative (October 10, 1996) which asserted "Far more time was spent on Annex 1A on military implementation than on Annex 3 on elections, Annex 4 on the Constitution, Annex 7 on the right of refugees to return and Annex 10 on civilian implementation taken together. While there were ambitious efforts to match missions and resources on the military side, on the political and civilian side there was agreement on a number of far-reaching principles, but only a weak and purely coordinating mechanism was set up to monitor how they would be put into practice."

*NATO and the UN*: The first liaison and coordination between NATO and the UN began with the 1993 enforcement of the no-fly zone. NATO began to operate under the authority of the UN and NATO's Southern Command (CINCSOUTH) worked closely with the commander of UNPROFOR. After that period, coordination took place at many levels and usually but not always with enthusiasm and without difficulty. Under the present SFOR deployment, liaison and cooperation is continual in formalized and informal ways with the UN Secretary General's Special Representative, UN High Commissioner for Refugees, UN International Police Force, and the UN International Criminal Tribunal.

The link between SFOR and the UN is outlined in SCR 1088 which mandates the Secretary General of NATO to report monthly to the UN Secretary General and the Security Council about how the force is carrying out its duties under the Dayton Peace Agreement. The last letter from the Secretary General to the UN assessed the situation "as being in general compliance with the military provisions of the Peace Agreement" but also included a summary of the problems on the ground, especially in the fields of displaced persons and low level violence.[16]

*NATO and the OSCE*: The second organization which NATO has worked closely with in Bosnia is the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). SFOR continues to have responsibilities for planning, administrative and logistical support for the OSCE's responsibilities for national, entity, and local elections. It has also aided the OSCE in its responsibilities for confidence and security building measures and arms reductions. This has meant supporting inspection teams and providing data on heavy weapons at authorized cantonment sites.[17]

---

[16] The last published report as of this time is dated 27th February 1997 and outlines both the progress and difficulties in Bosnia.

[17] For more detailed analysis of OSCE's new roles see Michael R. Lucas, "The OSCE Code of Conduct and Its Relevance in Contemporary Europe",Aussen Politik, vol.47,no.3 (1996),pp.223-235.

*NATO and WEU*: The third set of NATO relations are with the Western European Union (WEU). Relations with WEU were most intense during 1993 operation Sharp Guard which enforced UN embargoes against belligerents in the Adriatic. These activities were conducted under both WEU and NATO Councils with military advice given by a joint military committee.

*NATO and PfP*: The fourth set of NATO relations is with Russian and PfP countries. At the highest level, political co-ordination with Russia and PfP countries is carried out in NAC plus N - ie. the North Atlantic Council meeting with the non-NATO countries.[18] PfP countries are involved in operations at NATO headquarters and at SHAPE. Relations with Russia have proven particularly fruitful. Briefing Russia on NATO activities in the former Yugoslavia began early and Russia has contributed a brigade to both IFOR and SFOR. As explained by Leontiy P. Shevtsov, Russian Deputy to Supreme Commander to SFOR, "the Russian troops were not to be subordinate to NATO, but simultaneously the 'unity of command' principle had to be preserved".[19] The solution was to have all commands given to the Russian brigade emanate from the Deputy for Russian Forces in IFOR who reports to the Commander for SFOR.

Relations with Civilian Organizations in Bosnia

The Dayton Peace Agreement calls on the IFOR/SFOR to support the civilian re-building of B-H. Combined Joint Military Cooperation (CJIMIC) has been accomplished by linking military and civilian organizations in Bosnia. Staffed by both active and reserve personnel, the 400 civil affairs soldiers have cooperated in projects with international organizations and non-governmental organizations to obtain

---

[18] According to Gregory L. Schulte, NAC plus N met nine times between December 1995 and March 1997 "to consult on such issues as operational planning, rules of engagement, support to civil implementation, post IFOR security options and the activation of SFOR."See his "Bringing Peace to Bosnia and Change to the Alliance", NATO Review, no.2 (March 1997), p.24. Due to the date of completion and the ,as yet, lack of impact of these new arrangements on peacekeeping, the latest evolution in Russia and NATO institution-building, and Ukraine and NATO arrangements are not covered in this paper. For a basic introduction see the "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Co-operation and Security between NATO and Russia" ,signed on May 27, 1997.See,also, "NATO-Russian Relations: A Key Feature of European Security"NATO Review,no.3(June 1997).

[19] "Russian-NATO military cooperation in Bosnia", NATO Review, no. 2 (March 1997), p. 18.

materials, finances and personnel to carry out numerous tasks.[20]


Institutional Membership

---

[20] These include the Office of High Representative, OSCE, UNHRC, World Bank, EU, International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC) and others.

There is no need to repeat the well known prediction that a decision to enlarge NATO will take place at the Madrid meeting this July.[21] There has been a spate of newspaper and scholarly articles on the question of enlargement. The only mystery remains what countries will be admitted to that membership with most bets on only Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic admitted in the first wave scheduled for 1999. That does not mean that other countries do not have their advocates. For example, the Canadian government adds Slovakia, Slovenia and Rumania to the short list.[22]

United States Secretary of State Madeleine Albright may have gone a bit too far when she declared opponents of enlargement to be advocates of a "policy of fossilised immobility," but she had a point. NATO

---

[21]In recent weeks the cost factor has emerged as an issue in North America. The US State and Defence Departments estimate that the overall cost of enlargement will be between 27 and 35 billion US dollars during the years 1997-2009. According to the study, the new countries are to bear 35% of the costs, the USA 15%, and other NATO counties will share the remaining 50%. Earlier studies by the Rand Corporation estimated the overall cost at between 42 and 120 billion dollars. For background articles see "Preparing for the Madrid Summit", NATO Review, no.2 (March 1997).

[22] NATO members also wish to keep the door open for the eventual admission of other states. The Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have expressed a desire to join. Moldova offers to mediate between Russia and the alliance. Ukrainian officials have argued both for and against membership. Belarus opposes expansion. Albania and Macedonia may wish to join but that eventuality is a long way off.

needs to adapt to its new environment. As strategic business theorists would argue, successful managers must

bring the capabilities of their organizations in line with the external environment or they will fail. Instead of

using ad homonym arguments, however, Mrs. Albright could more cautiously have asked - what policy do

those who do not believe in enlargement favour? What is their positive agenda?

Of much more concern are the charges that eastern enlargement will jeopardize the arms-control

process and even current arms control agreements, and will strengthen the forces of reaction inside Russia.[23]

These are serious criticisms but their power can be alleviated by NATO making specific arrangements with

Moscow at the highest level. In the latest NATO-Russia agreement, the Founding Act, NATO has already

promised not to station nuclear weapons on new territories "in normal circumstances", to reduce its

conventional forces to offset its new advantage with an expanded membership and to cooperate in theatre

missile concerns. A NATO-Russian brigade has been set up for Bosnian peacekeeping and membership in the

G7 for Russia is on the horizon.

Among the future arrangements already made public by both NATO and Yevgeni Primakov, Russia's

Foreign Minister, is the idea of a "NATO-Russia Council" to be based in Brussels. The role and responsibility

of this consultative council can be fleshed out much further to give credence to Russia's claim to be an equal

partner with the West. The Council would be buttressed by a permanent secretariat in Brussels for the ongoing

discussion of Russian-Alliance interests.

NATO is leading the way in creating a new security architecture for Europe and its "look" East policy

is an important part of the change. Our arguments about NATO's transformation lead to much applause for

---

[23] For example see Jeremy D. Rosner,"NATO Enlargement an American Hurdle", Foreign Affairs, 75, no. 4 (July-August 1996), pp. 9-16: Peter Rudolf, "The Future of the United States as a European Power: The Case of NATO Enlargement", European Security 5, no. 4 (July-August 1996), pp.184-187 and "The USA and NATO Enlargement" Aussen Politik, 47, no. 4 (1996), pp. 339-347.

NATO but also leave many questions for the future. Despite the new Russian-NATO agreement, what reactions will to take place in Russian domestic politics? What will happen in the ratification process throughout the extant member states? Can all 16 states come to unanimous agreement? In particular, what debate will occur inside the United States Congress? And lastly, what will be the consequences for Eastern Europe: including the new members of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, and possibly more important those states inside the former communist empire which are not admitted as members in the first round? In particular what will be the consequences for the military formations of these countries?

Conclusions: Beyond Peacekeeping

As you read this paragraph the transformation of NATO will soon be complete. That gigantic step will not mean that there will be no quarrels or disputes in the Alliance. New issues and problems will continue to arise but they will be handled by a new NATO with new members who will bring their own unique ideas and solutions to the negotiating table.

Critics of NATO have abounded for years. It has always been in a state of trouble, crisis, near disaster or collapse. It seems always to be on its last breath, but, alas for its critics, so far NATO has always survived these disasters. My cynicism about these on-going complaints does not negate the fact that there are serious criticisms of NATO's behaviour. Many analysts challenge the lack of a more clear-cut European pillar and believe NATO's structure needs further revision. Others question its policy of accepting the challenge in Bosnia and believe it will be blamed if, or when, the multi-ethnic state actually falls apart after the departure of SFOR just over a year now. Lastly, critics as well-schooled as George Kennan challenge the expansion of NATO membership, calling it the "most fateful error"in the organization's history.

At the more general level even an optimist such as myself must admit to a certain concern for the apparent development of a new organization that de facto replaces world leadership by the United Nations with a purely military organization, led by the only superpower, the USA. But this is not the worry of the real anti-NATO crowd. What particularly galls NATO opponents has been its success where others have failed.

Nothing irritates academics more than other people's success.

However the issues in Bosnia are different than these more general concerns. IFOR/SFOR has successfully managed a Half Peace, but what has not been yet successful are the non-military operations. Municipal elections were put off and will not take place until September 1997. Despite some small problems however progress is being made in heading towards these elections. Candidates were registered by May 17 and voter registration is proceeding in a satisfactory manner.

But elections are not the only problem. War crimes remain unexamined.[24] Free movement of civilians across the line of separation is not fully established. The return of thousands of refugees who live outside and even inside Bosnia has met considerable hostility. Houses are regularly set on fire. Mine clearing continues to be necessary. Local difficulties continue to exist at the practical level in such fields as housing and employment. The small irritations may be the worst - it is, for example, still impossible to telephone between Sarajevo and Banja Luka.[25].

At the highest level discussions are proceeding very slowly. The Council of Ministers of B-H has only just concluded tentative agreements (1 June) on the most important issues on the so-called Quick Start package of laws for the new federation. Laws relating to a single central bank, common currency, budget, debt servicing arrangements, privatization and ownership of property, citizenship and even passports have not yet been finally settled, and until at least the basic laws concerning the economy are passed then it is impossible to obtain the necessary IMF loan or to have the required doners' conference take place by the end of June 1997 in order to begin a full scale reconstruction of the economy.

Nevertheless, NATO has shown that it can be a) employed outside of area; b) operate successfully under the authority of the UN. With the employment of NATO as its military arm the United Nations has finally come to understand what was needed in Bosnia, namely:

---

[24] For a discussion of the thorny legal issues on this topic see Alfred P. Rubin,"Dayton and the Limits of Law",The National Interest, no. 46 (Winter 1996/97), pp.41-47.

[25]See SFOR Press Conference, 13 March 1997.

1. a consensus on political purpose and objective;

2. a unity of diplomatic and military action;

3. a clear mission for military engagement linked to the       political purpose.

But the task ahead is formidable. The United Nations has set itself and NATO up for nothing less than the task of restoring a country, one which must be both democratic and accommodate plural ethnic/political groupings. The possibility of failure is great. The United Nations and NATO have set themselves up as state-builder in a divided country following an internal war and continuing hatreds. The context is one of warring communities and warlords.

Beside peace and a stable government, economic and social reorganization must be built up which ensures the political legitimacy and social-psychological dimension for future conflict resolution. So far this has not been accomplished. As NATO Secretary General Javier Solana clearly stated, the "basic conditions for a lasting peace in Bosnia - law and order, freedom of movement, functioning of common institutions - are far from being achieved."[26]

Such tasks have only been successful on few occasions. In fact, given the degree of enmity and economic dislocation it is even questionable if this dispute can be settled from outside without causing other problems such as a lack of legitimacy and weak leadership once the "peacemakers" have left. The country must come to accept its governing system and own form of stratification or it most certainly will degenerate into a tripartite partition in reality. In the presence of divided communities such as Bosnia there will always be minorities. In Yugoslavia the Muslims were in a minority. In Bosnia Muslims form the majority grouping and the Serbs and Croats are the minority. If Bosnia is allowed to break up, the Serbs and Croats would become the majorities in their rump states - unless of course they joined the states of Yugoslavia and Croatia which is likely.

The new constitution of Bosnia highlights "communities" or as they are called "entities" in an effort to

---

[26] Speech, NATO Secretary General, 30 May 1997.

build a federal regime where it would be impossible to impose a solution which <u>forced</u> integration of the three communities. This however is likely to mean the solution will work only in the short run or in the condition that substantial foreign troops are kept on Bosnian soil to prevent the inherent hostility from breaking out again and rupturing the state into its political factions. In this case it is not surprising that the High Representative Carl Bildt is already saying publicly that troops must stay past next the summer of 1998. The situation is a frozen conflict and it is not going to be thawed or melted.

NATO has done its job in parts of the former Yugoslavia but it is questionable whether the international community or the Bosnian people realize what still needs to be done.

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

<u>NATO and Peacekeeping Bibliography</u>

*Books*

Bellamy,Christopher, <u>Knights in Whaite Armour: The New Art of War and Peace</u> (London: Hutchinson,1996)

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros, <u>An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping</u> (New York: UN, 1992).

Brzezinski, Zbigniew, <u>Out of Control</u> (New York: Charles Scribner, 1993).

Cohen, B. and Stamkoski, G.,ed., <u>With No Peace to Keep: United Nations Peacekeeping and the War in the Former Yugoslavia</u> (London: Grainpress,1995)

Connaughton, Col. Richard, <u>Military Intervention in the 1990s: A New Logic of War</u> (London: Routledge, 1992).

Gottlieb,Gidon, <u>Nation Against State: New Approaches to Ethnic conflicts and the Decline of Sovereignty</u> (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1993).

Gurr, Ted and Barbara Harff, <u>Ethnic Conflict and World Politics</u> (Boulder Col.: Westview Press, 1994).

Holsti, Kalevi, J., <u>The State, War, and the State of War</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Lampe, John R.,<u>Yugoslavia as History</u>( Cambridge: CUP,1996).

Mayall, James, <u>Nationalism and International Security</u> (Cambridge: CUS,1993).

Parsons, Anthony, <u>From Cold War to Hot Peace: UN Interventions 1947-1994</u> (London: Michael Joseph, 1995).

Quinn, Dennis J. ed., <u>Peace Support Operations and the US Military</u> (Washington DC: National Defense University, 1994).


Richardson, James L., <u>Crisis Diplomacy</u> (Cambridge: CUP,1994). This volume reviews the latest literature on crisis management theory.

Smith, Dan, <u>The State of War and Peace Atlas</u> (London: Penguin, 1997).

Singer, Max and Aaron Wildavsky, <u>The Real World Order: Zones of Peace/Zones of Turmoil</u> (Chatham, N. J.: Chatham House, 1993).

Tayler, Trevor and Sato,Seizaburo, ed., <u>Future Sources of Global Conflict</u> (London: RIIA/Redwood Books, 1995).

Towle, Philip, Enforced Disarmament (Oxford:Oxford University Press, 1997).

Vasquez, John A., The War Puzzle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). This book also contains an impressive propositional list of the causes of war and an extensive bibliography on the subject.

Wardlaw, Grant, Political Terrorism, 2nd ed.,(Cambridge: CUP, 1989).


Articles and Theses

Bracken, Paul and Stuart E. Johnson, "Beyond NATO: Complementary Militaries", Orbis (Spring 1993), pp. 205-21.

Brecher, michael." Crisis, Conflict,War - State of the Discipline".International Political Science Review,17,no.2(1996),pp.127-139

Coffey, Joseph I. "What Future Role for NATO?Great Decisions( Washington: Foreign Policy Association,1996).

Connaugton, Col. Richard, "Wider Peacekeeping - How Wide of the Mark?", British Army Review, no. 111 (December 1995), pp. 55-64.

Debie, Frank, "Paper Tiger: Europe and the Crisis in the Former Yugoslavia", Cambridge Review of International Affairs X, no.2 (Spring 1997), pp. 122-140.

Foster, Edward, "NATO's Military in the Age of Crisis Management" (London: RUSI Whitehall Paper, 1995).

Frei, Daniel,ed., Managing International Crises (London: Sage, 1982).

Glaser, Charles, "Why NATO is still the Best: Future Security arrangements for Europe", International Security 18, no.1 (Summer 1993), pp.5-50.

Gravelle, Robert J. A. R., "The United Nations in Cyprus", unpublished PhD thesis (Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1994).

"Human Diversity"Special edition of Daedalus,126,no.2(Spring 1997).

Kende, I. "Local Wars since 1945", in E. Laszlo and J. Y. Yoo, eds., World Encyclopedia of Peace (New York: Pergamon, 1986).

Koslowski, Gerd, "Bosnia: Failure of the Institutions and the Balance of Power in Europe", Aussen Politik 47,no.4(1996),pp.359-367.

Kumar, Radha , "The Troubled History of Partition",Foregin Affairs76,no.1(1997),pp.22-34.

Mearsheimer, John, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War", International Security 15, no. 1 (Summer 1990), pp. 5-56.

Miller, Paul David, "Retaining Alliance Relevancy: NATO and the Combined Joint Task Force Concept", National Security Paper, no.15 (Cambridge Mass.: Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, 1994).

Palin, Roger H. "Multinational Military Forces: Problems and Prospects", Adelphi Paper 294 (New York: Oxford, 1995).

Rudolf, Peter, "The USA and Nato Enlargement".Aussen Politik,47,no.4(1996),pp.339-347.

Simon, Jeffrey, "Does Eastern Europe Belong in NATO?" Orbis (January 1993), pp. 21-35.

Thakur, Ramesh, "From Peacekeeping to Peace Enforcement: The UN Operstion in Somalia", The Journal of Modern African Studies 32, no.3 (1994), pp.387-410.

Van Evera, Stephen, "Primed for Peace: Europe after the Cold War", International Security,15, no.3 (Winter 1990/91),pp. 48-49.


Government Documents

Wider Peacekeeping (London: HMSO, 1995.

Bosnia Country Handbook (Washington DC: Department of Defense, 1995)

Press Releases and Documents January 1995 - June 1997 United  Nations, NATO and IFOR/SFOR.