

### *Calling All Regio-Cops*

bite with greater Chinese participation and, if Beijing behaves itself, eventually take up the U.N. flag in Cambodia.

Overall, then, there seem to be more cases where regionalism would work than where it would not. Last year, a National Intelligence Council study identified 23 countries with ongoing humanitarian emergencies and cited 9 others that were likely to develop crises. Of those 32 cases, the vast majority could benefit from regional peacekeeping or peace enforcement solutions—with some key exceptions, such as India, Pakistan, Russia, and possibly Nigeria itself. Moreover, in some places, regionalism has already become a tradition. The United States has long acted as a regio-cop south of its border, most recently in Haiti. And Saudi Arabia played such a role in the Gulf War, making the U.S.-led intervention palatable among the Arab world (if not to Osama bin Laden).

Nowhere has the new regional approach to peacemaking and peacekeeping been better demonstrated than in Kosovo. After the failures of Bosnia, the United States went into the Kosovo crisis with a bone in its teeth, brazenly determined to run the campaign through NATO alone. The U.N.—at first—was given no role at all. The Russians and their protests were barely tolerated and treated to dismissive hand-holding diplomacy. “We’re just trying to make them think they have a part,” said a U.S. official during the war.

All this had changed by the end of the 78-day NATO bombing campaign, however. Milosević had stood firmer than anyone had expected, and Clinton, by early June, faced the politically nightmarish prospect of ordering a ground invasion. Washington needed Moscow’s help; to get Moscow

on board, it needed the United Nations. Backed by a Security Council resolution and a U.N.-sanctioned peacekeeping force, the Russians proved crucial to finally forcing Milosević to cave in. NATO, the mightiest regio-cop in history, had to resort to U.N. legitimation to get what it wanted.

#### THE WAY OF THE GUN

Ironically, much of this “new” vision of peacekeeping is provided for in the U.N. Charter (in the long-ignored Chapter 8). But few observers have connected the dots between that section and the more commonly used Chapter 7, which dictates responses to threats to the peace. And regionalism gets a mere paragraph in the 70-page Brahimi report. Even such astute observers as Stanley Hoffmann, who nimbly took a middle road between the excesses of both traditional realism and liberal internationalism in his important 1998 work *World Disorders*, have tended to overlook the potential of the hybrid approach. In the book, Hoffmann concedes that the Security Council is “the main source of authority” when it comes to global legitimacy. But he plays down the potential link between U.N. power and regionalism, dismissing regional organizations as “too often embroiled in or neutralized by disputes among or within states of the region, or else lacking in means of enforcement.”

That is still sometimes true. Improving matters further will depend on the initiative of the nation that will undoubtedly continue to dominate the twenty-first century: the United States. Indeed, Clinton administration officials insist that they have long seen regional peacekeeping as their paradigm, pointing to such small-bore efforts as the African Crisis Response Initiative.