

## THE MECHANISM OF REGIONAL – GLOBAL SECURITY

Andreea Emilia DUTA<sup>1</sup>

---

**ABSTRACT:**

*THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT IS IN A STABLE STATE ALTHOUGH THIS DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE POSSIBILITY OF SPECTACULAR CHANGES IN THE BALANCE OF POWER AND INTEREST CENTRES. THUS, IT IS BECOMING OBVIOUS THE SHIFT OF FOCUS FROM THE TRANSATLANTIC SPACE TOWARDS THE PACIFIC ZONE. IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND TODAY'S TRENDS IT IS NECESSARY TO PROCEED TO A DIACHRONISTIC INTERPRETATION, NAMELY TO START WITH THE INCIPIENT STRUCTURING FORMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM.*

*SECURITY IS BOTH A STATE OF THINGS AND A MECHANISM THIS FACT COMPLETING FLEXIBILITY IN CONCEPTS BUT MOSTLY IN THE STEPS TO TAKE TOWARDS IMPROVING THE REFERENCE BACKGROUND AND IN KEEPING CONTROL UPON CONFLICT CENTRES, RISKS OR THREATS. THE SHIFT OF THE WORLD GRAVITY CENTRE TOWARDS THE PACIFIC, AS WELL AS THE CHANGE FROM UNILATERALISM TO MULTI-POLARIZATION ALONG WITH THE CRISES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF EURO ATLANTIC SPACE MAY BE UNDERSTOOD AS INVITATIONS TO A MECHANISM OF REGIONAL-GLOBAL SECURITY, AS IT IS DEFINED AND ACCEPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY.*

---

**KEY WORDS:** *SECURITY ENVIRONMENT, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, SECURITY MECHANISM.*

The international security environment is undertaking swift changes. Some of these changes are linear and predictable, either flowing directly from an objective development of the security environment or representing the outcome of different strategies and programs. Others are surprisingly featured just like a seism or lacking a continuous strategy, all of them being accompanied by a significant amount of uncertainty in strength and length of time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Goethe German Colegium, Bucharest.

## THE INCIPIENT STRUCTURING FORMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

Intergovernmental organizations came into being from the necessity of managing the international peace and security and the need of building up peaceful cooperation relationships between nations. Subsequently, the international organizations have been playing a fundamental role in the relations among nations by exerting an overcoming influence upon the evolution of contemporary world<sup>2</sup>.

The theory of modifying the international system structure by setting up world organizations as an important peace strategy was born ever since the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The role of such an international organization would be that of constantly maintaining the relations between its members and thus influencing their politics<sup>3</sup>.

An international organization sets up the frame and the necessary means of maintaining a natural continuous flow at all levels of the international cooperation and is in itself the most adequate means of balancing the member nation's position into this flow. The resolutions passed by these organizations should be the result of total compliance with the interests of the state members which, in their turn, should be willing to take action<sup>4</sup>.

It is difficult to evaluate to what extent the setting up of an international organization has influenced the conflicting behaviour within the international relationships, but it is certain that conflicts have not entirely been removed from the world. And yet something is being changed and that is the way people perceive conflicts. In the absence of an international organization conflicts would seem boundless because they separate the parties which try to annihilate each other whereas a conflict between members of an international organization - within which the parties cooperate and try to solve their dispute - seems to get important and efficient changes to decrease in violence<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> The possibility of a serious military confrontation of war is inherent in international relations. Theory of peace need not contest the basis realist conception of international politics as occurring in a state of anarchy. Kant did not, saying that nations, "like lawless savages, exist in a condition of ... war". Kant, Immanuel ([1795]1970) "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch" in Hans Reiss (ed.) Kant's Political Writings, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

<sup>3</sup> Much of the literature is dedicated to the study of war rather than the study of peace. If one simply equates peace with the absence of war, than the study of peace is just the mirror image of the study of war. Boulding Kenneth (1979) *Stable Peace*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

<sup>4</sup> Ionel Cloșcă, *Reglementarea prin mijloace pașnice a diferendelor dintre state* [Peaceful Settlement of State Disputes], (Editura Politică, București, 1985), 97.

<sup>5</sup> There are three variants of security cooperation; the relation former enemies after post-war settlement, the work of the United Nations Security Council (notable its permanent members), a normative proposition to replace the dangers and uncertainty of balancing. Both the League of Nations and United Nations Charter have tried to incorporate elements of collective security, with limited success. Down George W. (ed.) *Collective Security Beyond the Cold War*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Abbé de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743) was the first to talk about the theory related to turning the context of interaction between nations into a confederation and in this respect the drafted project of an international organization within which cooperation should be founded on property as guaranteed by monarchs. The idea was that the union should have enhanced security while the nations involved could have developed another type of foreign politics, free of wars. Abbe's plan was very modern and its 12 articles could be modified with no dissentient voice of the members. When a special commission failed in mediating a situation, the Senate was to give a resolution by two-thirds majority, resolution which thus became mandatory. Whoever used armed forces before a resolution or didn't comply with it was to become subject of military intervention. The plan to set up an international organization clearly laid under interdiction the use of armed forces<sup>6</sup>.

Throughout mankind history, regardless the size and type of human societies, there was always the issue of ensuring safety and security of states, a preoccupation which is now known as "peace architecture".

This is an institutional aspiration which would enable the world to avoid conflicts and live in harmony. In the modern times – a Westphalia of the past four centuries – the national states have devised different ways of building up this architecture. Within the context the relation between "global" and "regional" perspectives in security was rather ignored<sup>7</sup>.

Across the Westphalia centuries one can distinguish three phases in the process of building up the "peace architecture": the cooperation based on national sovereignty (from the 17<sup>th</sup> century up to the 19<sup>th</sup> century); the first two successive experiments, gradually integrated (in the 20<sup>th</sup> century)<sup>8</sup>.

Before the 20<sup>th</sup> century the regional security represented the peak in the strategy of politics and diplomacy. Global security – bearing the meaning of a unitary whole for a nation's own safety and redemption – is a concept that had already appeared in the Kantian philosophy. Efforts in achieving peace on the continent were made in Europe and America by means of state policies, during the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>6</sup> Down George W. (ed.) *Collective Security Beyond the Cold War*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

<sup>7</sup> The concepts of states, sovereignty and territory are the central to the study and practice of international relations. For generations of scholars, the concept of the state has been the principal subject and unit of analysis in international politics. Morgenthau Hans J. (1948), *Politics Among Nations*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf; Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*, Reading MA, Addison-Wesley.

<sup>8</sup> For this reason many concepts are doubtful: "regions' security" and "regional agencies mentioned in chapter VIII of the Charter". Abbot, Kenneth and Snidal, Duncan (1998) "Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42 (1): 3-32.

The evolving development or regional security architecture in Europe which has been leading the international community up to the present stage, can be related to the 17<sup>th</sup> approaches, whereas the progress in setting bounds and reducing conflicts between human societies has been slow and sinuous, viz. the Westphalian Peace which knew the passage from medieval empires and influencing spheres to the national state system. Despite provisions for “public peace” keeping in accordance with a “perpetual law” arbitrarily enforced, no security architecture established any operational mechanism to avoid conflicts<sup>9</sup>.

During the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, “legitimate wars” – caused by imperial ambitions – were carried on throughout the European continent until 1815 when, at the Congress in Vienna, combined forces succeeded in keeping peace and enforcing regional security by means of a balanced power system<sup>10</sup>. The great powers of Europe, subjects to a series of “temporary treaties of alliance”, were trying to keep order on the continent. However, this “European Concern” lasted for four decades and the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was periodically shaken by wars between the great powers that culminated into the clash of a devastating world war.

On the American land the 19<sup>th</sup> century knew the first arrangements for a continental security. In 1823 the United States proclaimed its sphere of influence on the American Continent<sup>11</sup>, the Monroe Doctrine being considered by them a genuine mechanism for the regional security, in spite of other countries’ (including neighbours) reticence.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Pan-Americanism became an effective movement for ensuring freedom of the Latin America from Europe. Towards the end of the century the movement turned into a continental security system which can be taken as the first genuine arrangement for a regional security in the two Americas. In 1890 the first pan-American Conference was held in the United States and aimed at “keeping peace on the American

---

<sup>9</sup> Westphalia Treaty – a treaty for peace between the Roman Empire and the King of France, together with their allies – concluded on October 24<sup>th</sup> 1648, articles 120-125. A great deal of recent work has involved more detailed historical understanding of how the institutional structure of the classic European state system emerged and developed. Grew, Wilhelm Gerog (2000). *The Epoch of International Law*, Berlin.

<sup>10</sup> The constitutional principles of the Westphalian system of sovereign states are intergovernmental in that governments mutually acknowledge each other as government, thus laying the foundation of international society. Bull Hedley (1977), *An Anarchical Society. A study of Order in World Politics*, Basingstoke, Macmillan.

<sup>11</sup> The recent independence from the European colonialism gained by the Latino-American countries makes the United States consider that any attempt of European powers to extend the system to the American hemisphere, is a danger to the continental peace and safety. Fearon. James (1994a) “Signalling vs. the balance of Power and Interests”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 38 (2): 236-69.

territory". In 1910 a pan-American Union was set-up during a conference with the goal to promote friendship and cooperation activities within the American space.

In the last period of the Westphalia era, the traditional policies in Africa, Asia and Pacific were subordinated to the European imperial powers.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, 200 years after Abbe's plan, The Nations Society and the United Nations Organization were set up following approximately the same directions as Abbe's model for an international organism<sup>12</sup>. Actually all these organizations are one theme with variations. Each of them makes proposals related to state confederations which, by integrating potential enemies within the same structure, become a real act of peace. Such an organization can change the international system, can release it from anarchy and set up a climate for communications, cooperation and transparency.

Although the idea of an organization that should bring its contribution to keeping peace in the world is a very old concept which has known different approaches in different stages of the history, it was only at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century when, after the First World War, the Nations Society was set up. "... the nature of new security risks and threats against the international community has long exceeded the frame of a global community as it was set after the Second World War. ... Regional organizations are more and more acknowledged as instrumental mechanisms in the new collective security system..."<sup>13</sup>

In 1919 there was the "first attempt to prevent war and keep peace, made by the League of Nations on the basis of four fundamental principles: non-aggression<sup>14</sup>, pacifist movement, collective security, low weapon level and self-determination. Non-aggression and pacifist movement are partial and are not absolute". The League's member states aim at observing each other's territorial integrity and political independence<sup>15</sup> and agree to protest against external aggressiveness.

---

<sup>12</sup> Traditionally, international institutions regulated the interaction between states, be it in the field of security (for instance alliance, arm treaties, etc.) or in the economy (reduction of tariffs). Their aim is to reduce external and internal threats to the security of human beings and their environment. Scharpf, Fritz W. (1999) *Governing in Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>13</sup> Touval, Saadia (1992) "The Superpowers as Mediators", in Jacob Bercovitch and Jeffrey Z. Rubin (eds.), *Mediation in International Relations: Multiple Approaches to Conflict Management*. New York: St. Martin's Press. Pp. 232-48. S/2004/546. A Theme Debate of the Security Council, July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

<sup>14</sup> The Covenant of the League of Nations (1919) bound its members to respect the territorial integrity of its members, while Charter of United Nations (1945) similarly asserted the principle of non-intervention in the affairs of member state. James, Alan (1992) "The Equality of States: Contemporary Manifestation of an Ancient Doctrine", *Review of International Studies*, 18 (4), 377-391.

<sup>15</sup> Balwin, David (1995) "Security Studies and the End of the Cold War", *War Politics*, 48 (1), 117-141.

Likewise, member states agree to solve a dispute by judicial means when this is possible and the diplomatic means fail<sup>16</sup>. By no means should member states declare war before three months from a final resolution or the publication of a report by the Council of Law; only after having followed all these steps can a state proceed to war operations. According to the above mentioned principles any war or threat of war affecting a member state is considered a problem for the whole League which can make “any decision which seems wise and efficient for the safe peace of nations”.

The principle of reducing the amount of weapons was the first global attempt in this respect and the League considered it a necessity for peace keeping. A national arsenal could be reduced to its lowest level so that national safety shouldn't be affected.

The principle of self determination was a novelty, too. At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there still were many colonies and metropolitan territories which were considered as not being capable of governing themselves under the conditions of a modern world. Anyway, many colonies ceased to be governed by the defeated countries which had formally ruled them. The League delayed giving steady mandates to the victorious ones which thus would have had to take the “hot” responsibility of governing former colonies which needed guidance from “more advanced nations” that due to their resources, experience and geographical position could carry out this mission.

A tutelage mandated was to the League's benefit and anyway it would have been given in agreement with the principle of self-determination, up to the moment when the countries under trusteeship could have governed themselves.

Some of the League's main limitations were trebled by: a country's right to declare war allowed it to call under arms again; the right of universal veto when making consensual decision under a crisis situation; the voluntary characteristic of a military contribution which weakened the mechanism of collective security. Although the idea of setting up an organization which would contribute to keeping peace in the world is a very old one that knew different approaches in different historical periods, its real acknowledgement was at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, after the Second World War when the Nations Society was set up.

On January 10<sup>th</sup>, 1920 the Nations Society Pact came into effect and thus the first international organization was created with the purpose of becoming an universal forum

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem, article 13.

that would provide the necessary frame for developing peaceful relations between nations<sup>17</sup>.

The standing possibility of declaring war to solve disputes between states – that is not keeping it under total restraint in the field of international relations – was, unfortunately, one of the big shortcomings among other important ones that the Pact contained<sup>18</sup>. Under these conditions the Pact's provisions could not prevent the escalation of tension and the outbreak of a new conflagration at the end of the third decade. The Permanent Court of Justice was to cease its activity seventeen years after it had been settled (1939)<sup>19</sup>.

The Court provided a framework for solving certain categories of disputes in which the Great Powers were not involved; not all the Great Powers had participated in building up a system of international collective security. Such was the Nations League which had been created without the Soviet Union that stayed out of the organization for a long period of time until 1934 when it became a permanent member in the Council. Moreover, the absence of USA and Germany was an organizational flaw which inevitably led to the suspension of the League's activity<sup>20</sup>. This demonstrated the necessity of having a working international organization in order to settle disputes. Characterized by shortcomings, the status of the Nations Society – with regard to the operational system – lacked many aspects and its provisions were so general that the question of norms or principles arose. In our opinion it was a progress in encoding the international law into principles, but the lack of regulations regarding democratic security mechanisms was the main shortcoming of this organization, which played a role in setting insignificant disputes but could not prevent or stop major conflicts. Otherwise, the preamble of the Pact stipulated that the Nations

---

<sup>17</sup> Although the Pact still stipulated war as a legal procedure in settling state disputes, peaceful settlement was a demanded priority. Thus, article 12 made provision for the situation of war outbreaking between member states and their obligation to go to arbitration, submit the issue for judicial settlement or to the Council's analysis. In accordance with article 14 the Permanent Court of Justice was created and any state could refer a dispute to it. Likewise the Court could endorse recommendations for any dispute submitted by the Assembly of Nations Society or the Council.

<sup>18</sup> This situation was remarkably described by Nicolae Titulescu: "The Pact made a war outbreak more difficult, but it did not rule out the legal war claimed by a nation's right; The Pact did not refer to a mandatory solution for international disputes or other solutions for all disputes without exception". See Nicolae Titulescu, "The Pact of Nations Society in Relation with Briand-Kellog Pact", as quoted by Ionel Cloșcă in his "*Peaceful Settlement of State Disputes*", (*Editura Politică, București*, 1985), 104.

<sup>19</sup> During this period of time The Court did not settle major disputes that threatened the world's peace but it had an important contribution to defining some institutions of international law and to adopting resolutions set as precedents. See George Elian, *Curtea Internațională de Justiție [The International Court of Justice]*, (*Editura Științifică, București*, 1970), 30.

<sup>20</sup> Powerful actor can always find a norm to support their consequentially based choice. Norms are often in conflict. International rules can be contradictory ... and there is no authority.

Society aimed at “developing cooperation among nations and ensuring their peace and security”<sup>21</sup>.

The Nations Society Pact<sup>22</sup> elaborated and adopted at the Peace Conference from Versailles (1919), was included in the peace treaties. The main causes of the Nations League’s failure were: lack of trust among the member states; lack of the principle of universality; lack of equality among the members; provisions related to war procedures instead of interdiction; small range of sanctions; ambiguity in formulating many of the Pact provisions; irrelevant activity and competency of the Council; lack of economical and social dimension in the relations of member states<sup>23</sup>.

Although at certain moments the Nations Society comprised a number of 61 states, it never achieved a universal characteristic.

Through its activity – formally carried out until April 1946, but actually ceased at the outbreak of WWII – the Nations Society did not demonstrated its ability of managing those situations for which it had been set up<sup>24</sup>.

When the Second World War broke out the final failure of the Society became obvious and decisive. Nevertheless, this end didn’t alter the idea that another intergovernmental organization could play a useful role on the international stage concerning nations’ peace and security<sup>25</sup>. Roosevelt suggested the idea of setting up a

---

<sup>21</sup> L. le Fur and G. Chklaver, *Recueil de textes de droit international public*, Paris, 1928, p. 259.

<sup>22</sup> Regarding the elaboration of the Pact, the great powers of the time played the main role: Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the United States of America. The Nations Society comprised 32 originator member states – signatory to peace treaties – and any other state which expressed effectively the accord of observing the Pact’s provisions and which received 2/3 of the General Assembly votes. Fearon. James (1995) “Rationalist Explanations of War”, *International Organization*, 49 (3): 379-414.

<sup>23</sup> Indulgent and sometimes passive in adopting resolutions which often had a reduced effect, the Nations Society could not prevent or stop severe conflicts and crisis that broke out in the 4<sup>th</sup> decade of the past century. Such examples are the conflict between Japan and China in 1931 and 1937 and the violation of Versailles Peace Treaty by Germany and Italy. Kugler, Jacek and Lemke, Douglas (2000) “The Power Transition”, in Manus Midlarsky (ed.) *Handbook of War Studies*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

<sup>24</sup> At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, there was an obsession with physical possession and control of territory, along with generally unchallenged assumptions about the benefits to be derived from that control. *The nineteenth-century scholar of geopolitics*. Friedrich Ratzel developed the concept of the organize theory of the state “which treated states as competitive territorial entities vying with one another for control over parts of the earth’s surface”. Murphy Alexander B. (2000) “Political Geography” in N.D. Smelser and P.B. Baltes (eds.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Amsterdam: Pergamon.

<sup>25</sup> The Atlantic Charter was signed by England’s Prime Minister and by the USA’s President on August 14<sup>th</sup>, 1941. On January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1942 the United Nations Declaration acknowledge the Charter after Great Britain, the USA, the Soviet Union and other 23 states from all continents signed it. The principles declared in the document were related to the future peace and the necessity to set up a larger and permanent world security. In 1942 and 1943 – during the war – more and more governmental officials of the anti-Hitlerite Coalition, vehemently called to setting an international organization.

centralized organism made up of the great powers and regional representatives of small states<sup>26</sup>. The World War development and the perspective of its outcome brought about a new direction to the idea of intergovernmental organization.

It became more and more obvious the necessity of a general international organization which – based on the principles of equality, sovereignty and people's freedom – was to become an efficient factor in keeping peace and international security<sup>27</sup>. Thus, simultaneously with the coordination of military operations in course, there also started an activity of elaborating some proposals regarding the management of the post-conflict situation and the setting up of a new type of intergovernmental organization. After they had drawn up several documents, the governments of the USA, Great Britain and Soviet Union convoked the Dumbarton Oaks assembly<sup>28</sup>.

On April 25<sup>th</sup> 1945, in the presence of 50 founding members<sup>29</sup>, the “United Nations Conference for International Organization” started in the Opera Theatre Hall in San Francisco. That was a historical moment for the United Nations Organization. At the end of the Second World War all states were fully aware of the unfortunate consequences resulted from the lack of a coherent strategy of peace keeping, aware of past mistakes, weaknesses of the international system and the friability of the international order. Under these conditions it became clear that preventing armed conflicts and establishing peaceful means of settling up disputes was one of the world's first objectives. In this respect a quick position was gained by the world: according to the Charter of United Nations (1945) wars are declared illegal and considered the most serious international crime<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>26</sup> President Roosevelt judged it necessary to keep peace and security by means of a central organization while economic and other different issues should be carried out by regional organizations.

<sup>27</sup> In Moskow Soviet Union, USA Great Britain and China – on October 26 h 1943 – agreed on a “Declaration of the four states concerning the world security”. The document stipulated “the necessity of settling up, as soon as possible, an international organization, based upon the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving countries and opened to membership of all the states either big or small, on the purpose of keeping the international peace and security”.

<sup>28</sup> The debates developed throughout two stages: from August 21<sup>st</sup> till September 28<sup>th</sup>, 1944 delegations from USA, Great Britain and Soviet Union carried out the works of the reunion while USA, GBand China continued from September 29<sup>th</sup> till October 9<sup>th</sup>. The debates were informal and aimed at prospecting the extent horizons of the new organization so intensely desired by the great powers. The final document was called “Proposals for settling a general international organization” – currently the document was also known as “Proposals from Dumbarton Oaks” and it represented the point of view of different experts (technicians and diplomats). The proposals status was that or recommendation for the participating governments. The involved great powers were to make proposals, shortly after the debates that would form the basis for a United Nations Conference.

<sup>29</sup> Which later were 51, after the admission of Poland.

<sup>30</sup> The United Nations Organization emerged from ruins of the Nations League, in 1945. The UN Charter's spirit came from the 19<sup>th</sup> century experience and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century through the experience of the League. The Charter was elaborated on the purpose of organizing a co-operation among the states

At the mid of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the global collective security was reinforced in the next experiment when it was believed that the Chart of United Nations would rectify the League's weakness. The Chart elaboration was based on the fundamental principles which made the "security architecture" of the international security be by half a century behind. The term of "peace" is used differently in the Chart of United Nations and does not have any clear explanation<sup>31</sup>.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the "classical" international law system equated "peace" with the absence of war.

In the course of international relations history there have been a number of attempts in creating and enforcing a broad collective security system:

1. Westphalia treaties system (1648) which put an end to the 30 year religion wars (1618-1648);
2. Vienna Congress system (1815) which put an end to Napoleon's era;
3. The Pact of Nations Society (1919) which represented an attempt in organizing the international relationships after WWI;
4. The Chart of United Nations (1947), when – after WWII – the victorious states succeed in organizing the international relationships;
5. The Fall of Berlin Wall (1989) since – after the Cold War – the international relations have been focusing on the market economy values, the democratic system and the promotion of individual rights and liberties.

## **SECURITY IS BOTH A STATE OF THINGS AND A MECHANISM**

The state of the international security depends on the legitimacy of the states behaviour, on their will to use peaceful means, to cooperate and to solve by negotiation the disputed matters. The international code of states demeanour for ensuring a state of security is formulated in the Charter of the United Nations<sup>32</sup>.

---

constituting the world's order system. In its turn the co-operation aimed at achieving progress, innovation in the field of international law, cultural cooperation, and women emancipation and, above all, a multilateral co-operation among the world's nations for preventing war and establishing peace through the methods of collective security.

<sup>31</sup> The United Nations founders – still under the strong impression of the WWII horrors – wanted the organization to be an instrument that should "deliver future generations from war scourge", as the Preamble to the Charter says. Consequently the United Nations' main mission is international security and peace keeping.

<sup>32</sup> Fearon. James (1994b) "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes", *American Political Science Review*, 88 (3): 577-92. See "Dan Canache", "The Brahimi Report and the Future

The security mechanism has several links. If, in a first stage the actions taken are for a peaceful settlement of the dispute (with different possibilities whenever the conflict has not surpassed the limits of a confrontation on force positions, that is it has not turned into a violent one), for the explosive stage (threats against peace and its violation and other acts of aggression), the Charter stipulates constraint measures, enforced by the Security Council.

The Charter stipulates as well, that the UNO member states shall accept principles and shall set up methods to guarantee that their armed forces would be used only for the common interest, and that they would suppress aggression. In this way, a world system for collective security coagulates and includes disarmament measures, too.

The security system conceived by the Charter, in opposition to the military alliances, is characterized by the fact that all countries, are guarantors of each other's security and they commit themselves solemnly to rejecting aggression, wherever it takes place.

An essential feature of the methods included into the Charter, in view of achieving security, is that their functioning is conditioned by the will of the member states and by their consensus.

The post cold-war evolutions in the field of running the world collective security mechanism often touch an extremely controversial issue: the intervention of the organization inside the states, even inside the UNO founding members, starting from the premise that they are "de-structured states" which could no longer extent any authority over the inside violence, for "humanitarian reasons", etc. This intervention is in serious contradiction with the article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, which mentions "matters that are essentially the internal competency of a state"<sup>33</sup>.

The use of peaceful means depends on the agreement of litigant states<sup>34</sup>.

The United Nations have asserted four goals: the international security and peace keeping, the self determination of the peoples, the settlement of the international matters and the harmonization of national actions towards achieving their common goals<sup>35</sup>. The achievement of the proposed goals is ruled by 7 principles which shaped the international

---

of UN Peace Operations", in Paul Duță, Grațian Lupu (ed.) *"The Polyvalencies of Multinational Operations"*, (Sibiu, Alma Mater, 2006), 38-47.

<sup>33</sup> See, for different points of view, Michael Bailey, Robert Mahuire and J. O'Neil G. Pouliot, HAITI: *"Military Police Partnership for Public Security"*, National Defence University, National Institute for Strategic Studies, Washington, D.C., 1998.

<sup>34</sup> See in, Cătălin Mitrache, "The Diplomacy of Peace", in Paul Duță, Grațian Lupu (ed.), *"The Polyvalencies of Multinational Operations"*, (Sibiu, Alma Mater, 2006), 47-53.

<sup>35</sup> United Nations Charter, Article 1.

relationships in the era of the United Nations<sup>36</sup>. The meaning the United Nations gave to peace is yet much more extensive, creating a larger semantic area and formulating peace as a dynamic and global system, which guarantees the social justice, the observance and recognition of human rights and of neighbourliness within all the countries. Thus, the Charter does not only compel the member states to give up threatening or exerting acts of violence in order to impose certain political objectives, but also calls all of them to appease their conflicts by peaceful means and to develop cooperation at all levels<sup>37</sup>.

Unlike the League of the Nations, the progress scored by the United Nations system in the “architecture of the security” is threefold. First, the war has been completely abolished by the provisions of the Charter, a mechanism for observing it, at least in theory, being provided. Second: the right of the 5 great powers, members of the Council, to put a veto on the decisions of intervention in support of peace and international/security. Third, the military contribution of the member states for actions supporting peace and international security is compulsive and voluntary.

In the era of the United Nations, the collective security has not functioned as foreseen by the articles of the Charter, because of three reasons: the existence of the nuclear weapons which made that the multilateral dimensions of the collective security be asymmetrical; the ideological separation between the USA and the USSR polarized the international community and paralysed the Security Council for more than 40 years; to a certain extent, due to the normative progress within the international relationships, the interstate conflicts diminished but, as a consequence of the post-colonial aggravated tensions, the inner conflicts increased. To preserve peace a collective system of security has been set up in the UNO Charter, with the Security Council as its control body. Only the Security Council has the right, according to Chapter VII of the Charter, to pass resolutions for using force against the states that threaten the world peace<sup>38</sup>.

---

<sup>36</sup> United Nations Charter, Article 2. These are: sovereign equality of member states, accomplishment in good faith of all obligations of the Charter; peaceful solving of international disputes; disuse of force against territorial integrity and political independence of the members; collective security; non-complicity with non-members and non-intervention in the members' jurisdiction.

<sup>37</sup> Peacekeeping became a very used term. A various range of civil and military operations are called peacekeeping operations. Fearon. James (1994b) “Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes”, *American Political Science Review*, 88 (3): 577-92.

<sup>38</sup> Such force measures may include non-military sanctions – for example economic and armed embargo, or military interventions using land, air and naval forces. Kriesberg, Louis (1998) “The Phases of Destructive Conflicts”, in David Carment and Patrick James (eds.), *Peace in the Midst of war: Preventing and Managing International Ethnic Conflicts*. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press). 33-60.

In this period, the global strategic stability is ensured efficiently, sometimes riskily by nuclear threat. The United Nations supports the global stability by adjusting the conflict appeasing techniques, in innovative and creative ways, making them practical and feasible from the political point of view.

By means of articles 33 – 50 of the Charter the main UNO organism, the Security Council is empowered to create a multinational military force made up of contingents of the army forces belonging to the member states<sup>39</sup>. The International Court of Justice decreed the fact that the military actions authorized by the Charter are not the only methods through which the Security Council can take action to keep peace. This happened for, in reality, the concept of “peacekeeping” was considered rather expansive.

While the Security Council holds as its main instruments the investigation, the mediation and the conciliation, the Charter can entitle it to overpass the borders of diplomacy and use a large range of armed means of coercion in order to preserve peace.

As an attempt to solve the controversies that may arise, the article 41 allows the Security Council to impose economic sanctions on a country, as well as other measures which do not entail military intervention. When these actions prove to be inadequate, the article 42 allows the Security Council to undertake any necessary action, using “land, air and navy forces” in order to re-establish and keep the international peace and security. These actions may include demonstrations, blockades and any other operations carried out by the land, navy or air forces of the United Nations members.

In the first two military actions, corresponding, to a certain extent, to the pattern of peace enforcement stipulated by the article 43 – namely the Korea War and the Gulf War – the Security Council didn't set a common control over the military operations displayed on its behalf. Moreover, the imperative tone, which might have turned the Council's resolutions from recommendations into lawful decisions, was carefully avoided. Therefore, the campaigns against Korea and the Persian Gulf were classified as actions required by the collective legal defence and not as the United Nations' peace enforcement measures<sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>39</sup> This multinational force is at the disposal of the Security Council and takes action under its direct coordination to preserve or restore peace any time the Council decides that all attempts to appease a conflict peacefully have failed. In such cases the Security Council and its Military Committee may energize the Charter norms referring to peace keeping by military means at the same time. Article 2 (7) of the Charter regarding the jurisdiction of the states over their interval affairs stipulates that the events taking place within their territories and which normally should be considered purely domestic issues, may become, in the situation of violating international peace, the subject of actions in force of the Security Council.

<sup>40</sup> Yoram Dinstein, *War, Aggression and Self-defence*, (Press Syndicate of University of Cambridge, 1994), 23.

Due to the fact that article 51 of the Charter states that self-defence actions, either individual or collective, are legal procedures, they do not need the previous consent of the Security Council.

When the multinational missions were first organized, the former UNO Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, together with the Canadian minister for foreign affairs Lester Pearson drew up a plan which aimed at interposing the UNO neutral peacekeeping forces between the fighting forces after the cease fire or truce conclusion had been agreed<sup>41</sup>. It was expected that their presence would help at observing the truce and would bring forth a detensed atmosphere, favourable to negotiations. These peacekeeping forces have light weapons and are deployed to the conflict areas only with the consent of the host nation.

The first action of this type was UNEF, carried out in 1956, which interposed the UNO troops, between the Israeli and the Arab forces after a truce had been signed in the case of Suez War, between 1956 and 1957. This UNO mission gave rise to the first contradictions concerning the use of force on other occasions than those related to self defence. Later, during the peacekeeping operations in Congo, the contradictions between the political principles of the UNO missions and the military demands they had to face increased more and more<sup>42</sup>. Instead of being regarded as a new type of operation, ONUC was perceived as an error which didn't have to be repeated ever. The controversies aroused by the mandate trusted to this mission had as consequence the interdiction of using force during the UNO peacekeeping missions, for a long enough period of time.

New directions regarding the use of force during the peacekeeping operations were set on the occasion of organizing the UNEF II mission, after the conflict between Israel and Egypt in 1973. The purpose of this operation was to supervise the cease fire process and the withdrawal of the Israeli military forces from the Sinai heights<sup>43</sup>.

The new conceptual delimitation of the idea of legal defence was not followed yet by concrete measures meant to strengthen the right of the peacekeeping troops to use force.

---

<sup>41</sup> Yoram Dinstein, see above, 16.

<sup>42</sup> The actual conditions of carrying out the UNOC mission made the self-defending military operations be similar to a standard military campaign. The mission mandate was extended so that the peace keeping forces could protect civilians and prevent flagrant human rights violation. UNOC was eventually authorized to use force in order to prevent a war outbreak and to expel the mercenaries who created disorder. See Simon Chesterman, *The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations*, 7.

<sup>43</sup> On this occasion the Secretary General of UNO - Kurt Waldheim - gave an extensive definition to self-defence. Thus, it also referred to those cases when the UNO forces had to thwart any attempt to impede its mission efforts in fulfilling the mandate given by the Security Council. See the Secretary General Report regarding the "*Implementation of UNO Security Council Resolution 340*" (1973).

Moreover, it was questioned within the Peacekeeping Operations General Principles, worked out in 1995. The extensive interpretation of the self-defence notion was criticized just because of the fact that it could have been understood as a right granted to UNO staff to open fire in a large variety of situations<sup>44</sup>.

## **PRO REGIONAL-GLOBAL SECURITY MECHANISM**

The time of solitary superpowers declined. One can speak about a multitude of visions over “the regional-global security mechanism”. The main concept within this mechanism is “regionalism”. That’s why, the first requirement is the concept of “regional security” for the international security and peace goals.

The concept of regional security is based upon three criteria: the members, the central zone and the mandate. The analysis of the regional security is the starting point for developing a “regional-global security mechanism” in the future. A delicate matter is the assignment of the regional representative as an element of the global mechanism of security.

According to the criteria of their purpose, three categories can be revealed: international, regional and sub-regional organizations. Two specifications are necessary: an official setting the international organization classification with a view to enforcing chapter VIII<sup>45</sup>.

In the specialty literature the regionalization of the security is approached from several points of views. For example, the regional security of the Middle East area is analysed from several perspectives: the “classical” one, associated with the USA security strategy during the Cold War; the “Arab” one, a corollary of “pan-Arabianism”; the “Islamic” one, starting from the ummah principle – foundation with ideological valences; the EU “Mediterranean” one, within the larger framework of its neighbour policy; the “Broad” one of the American strategists; the “Broad Mediterranean” one of the EU, in an incipient stage; the “Broad Middle East and North Africa” one (BMENA), proposed within a G 8 initiative for a partnership regardless the level of members.

---

<sup>44</sup> Fisher, Ronald (1983) “Third party Consultation as a Method of Intergroup Conflict Resolution”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 27 (2): 301-34. General Guidelines for Peacekeeping Operations, UN Doc UN/210/TC/GC95/(October 1995), <<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/training>>.

<sup>45</sup> “The time has come for the Security Council to proceed to a responsible and profitable dialogue in achieving a real partnership with worldwide structures and mechanisms that should contribute to security and peacekeeping.” Algeria, Security Council, July 20<sup>th</sup> 2004.

Regionalism, although an obsolete attitude of contemporary states not always oppose to globalization, due to its obvious advantage and superiority, as a promoter of the living standard improvement and of the higher western values is openly acknowledged here and there, by other civilizations<sup>46</sup>. The European Union has a global strategy concerning this area, in fact, these areas. This strategy lays the foundations of a subsequent EU action and, therefore, of the European Union complementary (but autonomous) contribution to the initiative “The Great Middle East” taken by the United States within G 8<sup>47</sup>.

Most countries from the area are compelled to face certain well-known problems. Most of these problems dwell on what was established by the United Nations Programme for Development. For this, social, political and economic reforms are necessary and they cannot be enforced from the outside, they must come from the inside and meet the needs and requirements of a mostly young population<sup>48</sup>, who must be provided with efficient and permanent education system and work places.

A typology could be:

- Global organizations – those having universal or almost universal members, from all the regions of the world.
- Trans-national organizations – with members from all, or several regions but who are limited by a selective criterion which excludes universality (political, religions, cultural).
- Extra-regional organizations – having an operational focus on a region but whose members may come from the outside of the region.
- Regional organizations – those having an operational focus on a region and whose members belong entirely to the region, without any external members.

---

<sup>46</sup> The fact is admitted that opposition to regionalism – unlike globalism – mostly emerges on “the inter-civilization fault lines” and proves to be difficult to overcome because of strong cultural, ethnical and religions beliefs of some nations. This occurs particularly in the Middle East and South-East Asia, where some states need counselling to accept wider perspectives. “Nowadays there is a larger interest in increasing the role of agreements and regional organizations, in yielding and enhanced international consensus from the relationships between UNO and regional organizations”. See Paul Dănuț Duță, *Instituții de Securitate, Partea Generală [Security Institutions, General Chapter]*, (Editura TecnoMedia, Sibiu, 2006), 155.

<sup>47</sup> At the Reunion in Brussels (March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2004) the European Council agreed on the so called “Strategic partnership between EU, Mediteranian Region and Middle East”. This cooperation, in the spirit of a partnership, aims at creating a climate of peace, prospering and progress in the region and stands on the instruments of Barcelona Declaration.

<sup>48</sup> More than half of the population in the region is made up of young people, up to the age of 18.

➤ Sub-regional organizations – those having an operational focus on a sub-region of a “parental-region” and whose members belong entirely to the sub-region, without any external members.

➤ Extra-sub-regional organizations – having the operational focus on a sub-region, whose members may belong to the “parental region” but not farther.

By definition, the sub-regional agencies are closer to the national levels of jurisdiction, than to the regional agencies or other organizations. They meet/answer more directly the communities and political people’s effort to create cooperatist links.

The phenomenon of sub-regionalism emerges independently from the United Nations and even from the regional agencies<sup>49</sup>. They exist and operate within a certain constitutional gap in terms of peace and international security. While they have a role to play, beyond any doubt there is a certain way that must be covered before a clear constitutional link may be developed with the regional agencies, which, logically if not politically, are their originating agencies.

*Geographical area of intervention.* Some organizations have a clearly – defined area of action, others don’t. Some of them are clearly designed to have an overall goal in their area of responsibility; others have regional or sub-regional focussing of their responsibilities. Some organizations may have a central area that extends beyond its own members. This aspect is important to distinguish the organizations having a real “internal focussing” from those which may also have an “external focussing” a distinction entailing implications:

- Global – the central area of the organization covers the whole planet;
- Trans-national – the central area of implementation covers the members’ territory, from all regions throughout the world but limited by the selective criterion of the members;
- Extra-regional – the central area of implementation covers the territory of its extra-regional members;
- Regional – the central area of implementation covers the territory of its regional members or, by consensus, other territories of the non-members from the same region;

---

<sup>49</sup> The UN Charter does not explicitly mention sub-regionalism which did not exist in 1945; it appeared in the ‘70s when it started to spread rapidly producing “concrete facts”. Regional agencies and the UN have been learning to live with the phenomenon ever since. Dixon, William (1994) “Democracy and Peaceful Settlement of International of International Conflict”, *American Political Science Review*, 88 (1): 14-32.

➤ Sub-regional – the central area of implementation covers the territory of its sub-regional members or, by consensus, other territories of the non-members from the same region;

➤ Extra-sub-regional – the central area of implementation covers the territory of its extra-sub-regional members.

Building up a global-regional mechanism which could be used in the field of peace and security depends upon the common understanding of the term “region” for the practical aims of Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. The next step is the “security regions”, defined according to the legal concept of “region”, identified by the General Assembly at the recommendation of the Security Council<sup>50</sup>. All general parameters defining the “security regions” should be taken into account: geography, culture and geo-strategy.

*Geographical regionalism.* The classical perception of regionalism, including the terms of security and traditional peace as well, is connected to the geographical demarcation. In 1940, Winston Churchill was supporting the idea of “separate councils” for Europe, Asia and America “under the same common roof of a global organization”, on the purpose of keeping peace in these regions. The Latin-American Block struggled for the “Latin-American Security System” in San-Francisco, taking into consideration only the United States. ASEAN came into being under the form of a regional agency, when the Founding Member States set up the collaboration frame, according to clear principles, for the South-East of Asia. When an outside state tried to join the Agency it was denied on the basis of geographical principles.

The main geographical regions of the world can be considered security regions: Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, South America and Australia<sup>51</sup>.

*Cultural regionalism.* Determined by the cultural factor, with a location of ethnic groups and their distinct features and of linguistically related groups as well.

The historical factors of the ancestral migration, together with the modern sociopolitical ones gave birth to a remarkable mosaic of about 3000 languages spoken all

---

<sup>50</sup> It relates to an issue debated at the Regional Assembly (1950). The point referred to the regional status of Arabian League and its jurisdiction over some security zones clearly defined. This concept is in agreement with that of regional security complexes as presented by Buzan and Waever in “*Structures and Powers: International Security Structures*”, (CUP, Cambridge, 2003).

<sup>51</sup> Australia is the only continent on which there stretches only one nation state which together with New Zealand and the Pacific island-states from Oceania – form a region alternatively called the Pacific or the Oceania; the Pacific is a term frequently used in the political discourse.

over the world<sup>52</sup>. The relation between language, with its socio-cultural features, and security is obvious; the relation between regionalism and language, materialized in the fight for survival, is a historical constant as well.

The ethnic groups clashes is one of the most powerful causes of sub-regional and national instability, the aspect of minority rights being one of the most sensitive issues of politics and security<sup>53</sup>.

*Geostrategic politics.* Geostrategic reasons play a major role in defining security regions. Of course there are other reasons too.

---

<sup>52</sup> There are three or four thousand languages all over the world still spoken today – probably a few thousand less than they were before the establishment of the present main languages. Anyway, it is important to consider these things in perspective. Statistics reveal a great truth: out of the several thousand languages of the world, less than 100 are spoken by more than 95% of the population. Among them, the Chinese people mean about 20% and, if we add the English, the Spanish and the Russian peoples, the number increases to 45%. The German, the Japanese, the Arab, the Bengal, the Portuguese, the French and the Italian peoples raise the number to 60%, while the next most important languages increase the number to 75% (Katzner, K. *The Languages of the World*, reference Publisher, London-New York: 1992, pp. VI-X).

<sup>53</sup> The issue has a rather academic significance. In 1985, when the Rarotonga Treaty Negotiations were concluded and a nuclear-free zone was set in the South Pacific, the delegates initially assumed that the Treaty would be translated in all the languages of the area, until it was admitted the fact that only throughout one of the states involved, more than 700 languages were spoken. In 2004, the enlarged European Union translated and interpreted in 20 languages. A balance point between the concern for minority rights and the logistic capacity must be found out somehow.

## REFERENCES

1. **Abbot, Kenneth and Snidal, Duncan** (1998) "Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42 (1): 3-32.
2. **Banks, Jeffrey** (1990) "Equilibrium Behaviour in Crisis Bargaining Games", *American Journal of Political Science*, 34 (4): 599-614.
3. **Dixon, William** (1994) "Democracy and Peaceful Settlement of International of International Conflict", *American Political Science Review*, 88 (1): 14-32.
4. **Dixon, William** (1996) "Third-party Techniques for Preventing Conflict Escalation and promoting Peaceful Settlement", *International Organization*, 40 (3): 653-81.
5. **Druckman, Daniel and Stern, Paul** (1997) "Evaluating Peacekeeping Missions", *Mershon International Studies Review*, 41 (1): 151-65.
6. **Druckman, Daniel, Broome, Benjamin and Kroper, Susan** (1988) "Value Differences and Conflict Resolutions", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 32 (3): 489-510.
7. **Fearon. James** (1994a) "Signalling vs. the balance of Power and Interests", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 38 (2): 236-69.
8. **Fearon. James** (1994b) "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes", *American Political Science Review*, 88 (3): 577-92.
9. **Fearon. James** (1995) "Rationalist Explanations of War", *International Organization*, 49 (3): 379-414.
10. **Festinger, Leon** (1957) *A theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
11. **Fisher, Roger** (1971) "Fractionating Conflict", in Joan V. Bondurant (ed.), *Conflict: Violence and Nonviolence*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton. Pp 135-45.
12. **Fisher, Ronald** (1983) "Third party Consultation as a Method of Intergroup Conflict Resolution", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 27 (2): 301-34.
13. **Galtung, Johan** (1969) "Violence, Peace and Peace Research", *Journal of Peace Research*, 5 (3): 67-91.
14. **Gartzke, Erik** (1999) "War is in the Error Term", *International Organization*, 53 (3): 567-88.
15. **Gartzke, Erik** (1981) *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. **Jett, Douglas** (2000) *Why Peacekeeping Fails*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
17. **Kacowicz, Arie M.** (1994) *Peaceful Territorial Changes*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
18. **Kant, Immanuel** ([1795]1970) "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Stretch', in Hans Reiss (ed.), *Kant's Political Writings*". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. **Kelman, Herbert** (1997) "Social-psychological Dimensions of International Conflict", in I. **William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen** (eds.), *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*. Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace. Pp. 191-237.
20. **Kelman, H.C. Cohen, S.P.** (1979) Reduction of International Conflict: An International Approach', in W. G. Austin and S. Worchel (eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Belmont: Wadsworth. Pp. 288-303.
21. **Kleiboer, Marieke** (1996) "Understanding Success and Failure of International Mediation", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 40 (2): 360-89.

22. **Kleiboer, Marieke** (1996) *The Multiple Realities of International Mediation*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
23. **Kreps, David** (1990) *Game Theory and Economic Modelling*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
24. **Kriesberg, Louis** (1998) "The Phases of Destructive Conflicts", in David Carment and Patrick James (eds.), *Peace in the Midst of war: Preventing and Managing International Ethnic Conflicts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. Pp. 33-60.
25. **Kugler, Jacek and Lemke, Douglas** (2000) "The Power Transition", in Manus Midlarsky (ed.) *Handbook of War Studies*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
26. **Tetlock, Philip** (1998) "Social Psychology and World Politics", in D. Gilbert, S. Fiske and G. Lindzey (eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, vol. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> edn. New York: McGraw-Hill. Pp. 868-914.
27. **Touval, Saadia** (1992) "The Superpowers as Mediators", in Jacob Bercovitch and Jeffrey Z. Rubin (eds.), *Mediation in International Relations: Multiple Approaches to Conflict Management*. New York: St. Martin's Press. Pp. 232-48.
28. **Touval, Saadia** (1994) "Why the UN Fails", *Foreign Affairs*, 73 (5): 44-57.
29. **Zartman, I. William** (1985) *Ripe for Resolution: Conflict and Intervention in Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
30. **Zartman, I. William** (1999) "Dynamics and Constrains in Negotiations in Internal Conflicts", in I. William Zartman (ed.), *Elusive Peace: Negotiating an End to Civil Wars*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Pp. 3-29.