

We assume that the international system is inherently rigid and has a limited capacity for self-correction. But we also assume that the end of the Cold War offers a window of opportunity to undertake bold reforms. At the same time, instead of creating new organizations or new obligations, one should try to improve existing multilateral organizations and instruments, most of which have yet to fulfil their promises.

A CASE FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION:

Given that our overall approach implies eventually a high degree of internationalization, it is important to anticipate the possible consequence of such an approach and the arguments which can be adduced pro and con. In existing studies on this subject, it is possible to distinguish five different patterns:

- (1) the exacerbation of the conflict through foreign intervention;
- (2) the prolongation of the conflict as the result of the intervention of outside interests;
- (3) the moderation of the conflict because of the international concern and pressures;
- (4) conciliation of the parties to a conflict due to the mediation or intervention of an outside party; and
- (5) supersession of the conflict, in other words, the ethnic conflict may be superseded by a conflict among non-ethnic and particular interests, in which outside parties turn the conflict into something different.¹⁴

These categories are not mutually exclusive. They might even represent the various phases through which some conflicts pass. Past experience tends to demonstrate, however, that the consequences of outside intervention largely depend on the timing of such an intervention:

- early intervention, before escalation, and later intervention, after the exhaustion of warring parties, are the stages where a resolution is most likely to be achieved.
- mid-point escalation is unlikely to lead to a resolution, as the parties have gone too far to turn back (and animosities have been kindled past the point