

the alliance. The overriding principle that directs civil-military relations in multinational coalitions (as it is in liberal democracies) is military deference to the civil authority.

Integration and Internationalization of Structures for Decision Making The lessons of previous alliances emphasize the critical importance of mechanisms for managing coalition affairs. The principles of national sovereignty and equality led NATO, the United Nations, and other successful coalitions to build multinational mechanisms or structures that incorporate the central coordination of policy, standard decision-making procedures, and the internationalization of political and military staffs. These types of structures provide the most efficient way for coalitions to develop sophisticated set of plans and procedures linked by modern communications systems to undertake complex operations involving the interests of many states.

Rule by Consensus Coalitions of equals necessarily rule by consensus. That is, as a norm, if not a principle, all decisions, recommendations, and plans must have the concurrence of all members before they can be put into action. An implicit understanding underlying the rule of consensus in most coalitions is that those who take decisions that may lead to the expenditure of "blood and treasure" must be prepared also to take the risks that such decisions may entail. An inherent respect of the relationship between risks and decision is usually supported by a tacit observation of "the rule of the most affected," whereby those members least affected acquiesce to the preferred solutions of those who are directly at risk.

The Military Regime Military affairs in coalitions, even in those where combat is not anticipated, require careful management and control not only because of the nature of armed forces, but also because national armed forces are a conspicuous link to domestic public opinion. Whenever coalition military operations harm national armed forces, public interest will be aroused and the cohesion of the coalition might be jeopardized. The United Nations, for instance, has been greatly criticized and suffers as a coalition leader because of its many shortcomings in managing coalition operations in the field.

The western allies and North Atlantic Alliance established norms to help redress the most difficult aspects of multinational military operations. There are only a few norms and rules but they have been effective and could be easily transferred into any coalition. Indeed, the "NATO-standard" is the basis for the United Nations Military Staff Committee system (which is, unfortunately, moribund), and UN operations during the Korean and Gulf wars. More recently, this regime is used as the foundation for the reform of military forces in states seeking entry into NATO and European military organizations.

Predominance of National Chiefs of Defence National chiefs of defence, or committees of service chiefs, are responsible for the organization, deployment, and conduct of operations of national military forces. They are ultimately accountable for these responsibilities to national political leaders, who in turn are accountable to the people. Two strong sentiments rooted in nationalism and the nation-state militate against any uncontrolled surrender of this responsibility and accountability to foreign officers. Ultimately, the choice between competing national and coalition military needs will be made within the national, not the international, political process and chiefs of defence will inevitably be part of that process. Chiefs of defence must be appropriately integrated