



**THE NEW  
AGENDA FOR  
GLOBAL  
SECURITY:**

*COOPERATING FOR PEACE  
AND BEYOND*

*Edited by  
Stephanie Lawson*

# **The New Agenda for Global Security: *Cooperating for Peace and Beyond***

*edited by  
Stephanie Lawson*

**Allen & Unwin  
in association with the  
Department of International Relations,  
RSPAS, ANU, Canberra, ACT**

© Stephanie Lawson, ed.

This book is copyright under the Berne Convention. No reproduction without permission. All rights reserved.

First published in 1995.

Allen & Unwin Australia Pty Ltd.  
9 Atchison St, St Leonards, NSW 2065, Australia.

Department of International Relations, RSPAS,  
Australian National University, Canberra ACT 0200, Australia.

National Library of Australia  
Cataloguing-in-Publication entry:

Lawson, Stephanie.  
The New Agenda for Global Security:  
*Cooperating for Peace and Beyond.*

ISBN 1 86373 974 2.

1. Evans, Gareth, 1944– . Cooperating for peace.
2. United Nations – Armed Forces. 3. Peace. 4. Security, International. I. Lawson, Stephanie. II. Australian National University. Dept. of International Relations. (Series: *Studies in world affairs*; no. 10).

327.172

Unless otherwise stated, publications of the Department of International Relations are presented without endorsement as contributions to the public record and debate. Authors are responsible for their own analyses and conclusions.

Cover design by ANU Graphics.  
Printed by ANU Printery, ANU, Canberra ACT 0200, Australia.

# Abbreviations

<b>CSBM</b>	<b>confidence and security building measure</b>
<b>CSCA</b>	<b>Conference on Security and Cooperation in Asia</b>
<b>CSCE</b>	<b>Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe</b>
<b>CWC</b>	<b>Chemical Weapons Convention</b>
<b>DFAT</b>	<b>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</b>
<b>GATT</b>	<b>General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade</b>
<b>GIC</b>	<b>good international citizenship</b>
<b>IAEA</b>	<b>International Atomic Energy Agency</b>
<b>IGO</b>	<b>international governmental organisation</b>
<b>MTCR</b>	<b>Missile Technology Control Regime</b>
<b>NAFTA</b>	<b>North American Free Trade Agreement</b>
<b>NIEO</b>	<b>New International Economic Order</b>
<b>NPT</b>	<b>Non-Proliferation Treaty</b>
<b>ODA</b>	<b>Official Development Assistance</b>
<b>OECD</b>	<b>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</b>
<b>SIPRI</b>	<b>Stockholm International Peace Research Institute</b>
<b>SLORC</b>	<b>State Law and Order Restoration Council</b>
<b>UN</b>	<b>United Nations</b>
<b>UNDP</b>	<b>United Nations Development Program</b>
<b>UNESCO</b>	<b>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</b>
<b>UNOSOM</b>	<b>United Nations Operation in Somalia</b>

# Acknowledgements

Edited books are notoriously difficult to put together and this one was no exception. The Department of International Relations at the Australian National University, however, is more fortunate than most academic departments in having a highly efficient and dedicated research and editorial staff whose efforts have made my task as Editor so much more bearable. Robin Ward's and David Sullivan's help in proof-reading and tracking down important references is very much appreciated. Robin also undertook the more gruesome work of copy-editing, as well as compiling the index. Lynne Payne produced, as usual, a top-quality final copy.

Thanks are due also to the United Nations Association of Australia for assistance with the publication costs, and to the Association's National Administrator, David Purnell, for his very helpful and supportive role throughout the production of this book.

# Contributors

**Andrew Butfoy** is lecturer in strategic studies and arms control in the Centre for International Relations, Department of Politics, Monash University, Melbourne. He has held appointments at the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst; he received his PhD from the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University. Butfoy's current research interests are in the strategic implications of common/cooperative security.

**David Campbell** is the author of *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Minnesota University Press, Minnesota, 1992 and *Politics Without Principle: Sovereignty, Ethics and the Narratives of the Gulf War*, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, 1993. During 1994/95 he was Senior Lecturer in the Graduate Program in Foreign Affairs and Trade and a Research Fellow in the Peace Research Centre at the ANU. He now teaches international politics at Keele University.

**Hilary Charlesworth** is Professor of Law at the University of Adelaide. She received her BA and LLB from the University of Melbourne and her SJD from Harvard Law School. Her main teaching and research interests are international law, human rights law and feminist legal theory. She is a member of the Executive Council of the American Society of International Law, deputy Chair of the Australian government's National Consultative Committee on the UN World Summit for Social Development and a member of the Australian Council for Women which is advising the Australian government on preparations for the Fourth UN Conference on Women.

**A.B. Fetherston** previously was a Post-Doctoral Fellow in the Peace Research Centre at the Australian National University and is currently a lecturer in the Department of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford in the UK. She holds a BA in psychology from the University of Connecticut in the United States and an MA and PhD from the Department of Peace Studies at Bradford. Her teaching and research is multidisciplinary but broadly covers theories/understandings of conflict and conflict transformation. She has written a number of papers on United Nations peacekeeping and has testified before the Australian Parliament's Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade on the subject of Australia's participation in peacekeeping. Her recent book, *Towards a Theory of United Nations Peacekeeping* was published in 1994 by Macmillan/St Martin's.

**David Goldsworthy** is Professor of Politics and Director of the Centre for International Relations at Monash University. He is a Fellow of the

Royal Historical Society, a former president of the Australasian Political Studies Association and a former editor of the *Australian Journal of International Affairs*. His research and teaching interests include the politics of decolonisation, Australian foreign policy, and North–South relations, in particular the politics of foreign aid. His most recent publication is an edited book, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire 1951–7*, 3 vols, HMSO, London, 1994. His main current research project is an archivally based study of Anglo–Australian interactions on imperial, Commonwealth and colonial issues in the 1950s and 1960s.

**Peter Lawler** recently took up a position as lecturer in international relations in the Department of Government at the University of Manchester. Prior to this he taught in the Department of Politics, Monash University where he was also Director of the Centre for International Relations, 1993–94. His current research interests revolve around the theory and practice of varieties of internationalism, with a particular focus on social democracy and foreign policy. Recent publications include: *A Question of Values: Johan Galtung's Peace Research*, Lynne Rienner, Boulder and London, 1995; 'Constituting the Good State', in *Critical Politics: From the Personal to the Global*, ed. Paul James, Arena, Melbourne, 1994; and 'Strasbourg Rolled', *Arena Magazine*, no. 12, August–September 1994.

**Richard Leaver** was formerly a Research Fellow at the Peace Research Centre, and a Senior Research Fellow in the Department of International Relations, Australian National University. He now teaches in the Politics Department at The Flinders University of South Australia, where he convenes a Master of Arts (International Relations) program. His recent publications include two co-edited books: *Pacific Economic Relations in the 1990s: Cooperation or Conflict?*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1993, and *Charting the Post-Cold War Order*, Westview, Boulder, 1993. His research interests lie primarily in the fields of International Political Economy, the politics of nuclear non-proliferation, and Australian foreign policy.

**Samuel M. Makinda** is a Senior Lecturer in the Politics Department at Murdoch University. He was a Visiting Fellow in the Global Security Programme at the University of Cambridge in 1992; a Research Associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in 1989–90; and a Guest Scholar at the Brookings Institution in Washington, DC, in 1983. He is the author of *Seeking Peace From Chaos: Humanitarian Intervention in Somalia*, London and Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1993; *Security in the Horn of Africa*, Adelphi Paper No. 269, London, Brassey's for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1992 and *Superpower Diplomacy in the Horn of Africa*, London, Croom Helm, 1987. He has also published articles on regional and international security in more than a dozen journals, including *The World Today*,

*Survival, Orbis, Strategic Survey, Europa Archiv and the Australian Journal of International Affairs.*

**Michael McKinley** is a graduate of the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand (Asian Studies, International Politics, and Political Science) and the Australian National University (International Relations). He has also been a research scholar at the State University of Leiden, The Netherlands, and Trinity College, The University of Dublin. His teaching, research, and writing encompass work on major themes in global politics and security, especially in relation to the roles of the United States, the Australia-US alliance relationship, and philosophies and practices of war and peace. Most recently he was the contributing editor of *The Gulf War: Critical Perspectives*, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards, NSW, 1994. Dr McKinley is currently Senior Lecturer in Global Politics in the Department of Political Science, The Faculties, the Australian National University.

**Ramesh Thakur**, Professor of International Relations and Director of Asian Studies at the University of Otago in New Zealand, is Head of the Peace Research Centre at the Australian National University in Canberra for 1995-96. Educated in India and Canada, he has taught in Fiji and New Zealand. Among other works he is the author of *Peacekeeping in Vietnam: Canada, India, Poland and the International Commission*, University of Alberta Press, Edmonton, 1984 and *International Peacekeeping in Lebanon: United Nations Authority and Multinational Force*, Westview, Boulder, 1987; and co-editor of *A Crisis of Expectations: UN Peacekeeping in the 1990s*, Westview, Boulder, 1995.

# Foreword

*The New Agenda for Global Security: Cooperating for Peace and Beyond*, brings together a range of direct responses to Gareth Evans's *Cooperating for Peace: The Global Agenda for the 1990s and Beyond* (also known as the 'Blue Book') which was launched at the 48th General Assembly of the United Nations in 1993. Many of the contributors have also addressed Evans's subsequent article on 'Cooperative Security and Intrastate Conflict', published in *Foreign Policy* in 1994, for which he was awarded the prestigious Grawemeyer Prize for Ideas on Improving World Order by the University of Louisville in Kentucky.

Most of the chapters in the present collection were first presented at a seminar held at the Australian National University in Canberra in July 1994. The seminar was sponsored jointly by the United Nations Association of Australia and the Australian National University's Peace Research Centre, the Department of International Relations and the Centre for Public and International Law. The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade assisted the seminar by way of funding.

Among the issues which arose at the seminar was whether the Blue Book was adequately grounded in wider scholarly and public debates about international relations. It was suggested by some that it arose in a departmental analysis vacuum removed from other spheres of innovative thinking about such matters as power politics, development and justice, and the new world order more generally. Other participants, however, noted that the Blue Book had at least canvassed a number of ideas that non-government peace groups had been promoting for some time. At the same time, the almost complete 'absence' of women from the Blue Book was said to indicate a serious lack of balance in Evans's approach. There was general agreement as well that Evans's focus, which was concentrated largely on state actors, paid insufficient attention to the role of non-governmental organisations, thereby limiting perspectives on the range of options available for dealing with global problems.

Another important aspect of the debate at the seminar concerned the scope for humanitarian intervention in crisis situations. Several participants noted that however well-meaning the motivations for such intervention might be, there were very real dangers associated with the tendency of 'outsiders' to ignore local structures and knowledge. The point was also made that the use of the UN as a vehicle for intervention had often meant giving the most powerful states control of the criteria for intervention. In addition, it was noted that the value of sanctions against repressive and abusive regimes was dubious—only very selective appli-

cation is likely to have desirable effects without placing too heavy a burden on the ordinary people of the country.

With respect to the United Nations, several participants drew attention to the pressing need for reform in order to enhance the organisation's capacity to respond effectively to the serious conflicts now taking place within (and beyond) the borders of states. The Blue Book's broadly-sketched suggestions for reform, however, were generally accepted as reasonable and did not generate much critical debate at the seminar. One aspect that did receive more attention was the potential for non-government organisations to contribute increasingly to the work of the UN through its many fora, including those dealing with human rights, disarmament and refugees.

Although the Blue Book was subject to some sharp critique at the seminar, it was nonetheless welcomed by many of the participants as an important Australian initiative in promoting fresh thinking, both conceptual and practical, on pressing global problems. At the same time, it was hoped that more detailed analysis would follow in order to place Evans's suggestions more firmly in the context of practicable action. This has been achieved, to some extent, by the subsequent publication in 1994 of *Building International Community: Cooperating for Peace Case Studies*, edited by Kevin Clements and Robin Ward.

The variety of perspectives on Evans's book that were evident at the seminar—both in the formal presentations and the discussions that followed—are reflected in the diverse contributions to the present volume. The themes dealt with range from issues concerning peace-keeping, arms control, sanctions and United Nations reform to the notion of 'cooperative security', Third World sovereignty, the idea of 'good international citizenship' and the ethical assumptions and 'silences' of the Blue Book. The diversity of the contributions is apparent also in the nature of the responses to Evans's overall project. Some contributors, although critical of certain aspects of the analysis, accept the basic premises of the book and acknowledge the author's initiative in putting forward important new emphases for foreign policy approaches which stress prevention rather than deterrence, and cooperation rather than coercion. The Blue Book's stress on non-military alternatives for dealing with international crises, and on avenues for building conflict resolution mechanisms that would prevent such crises from escalating to war, are also welcomed as very positive aspects of Evans's approach.

Other contributors believe that the approach of the Blue Book falls well short of a comprehensive understanding of present trends, and that its credibility is seriously undermined as a result. The Blue Book is seen to err, for example, in oversimplifying the complexities of international trends in order to push a particular prescriptive line on multilateralism and interdependence that suits Australia as a middle power, but does not necessarily suit other countries with markedly different circumstances. It is also suggested that the 'culture of cooperation' highlighted by Evans

has emerged essentially from the imposition of dominant Western values on the rest of the world. Furthermore, the assumption that all countries increasingly desire interdependence and cooperation ignores the very real differences in the way that interests relating to these goals may be perceived by other countries.

Included in the collection is a rejoinder from Evans himself. While acknowledging the force of some of the criticisms, and generally welcoming them as a further contribution to the important dialogue on global security problems, Evans stands firm on the basic convictions that inform the *Blue Book* and its positive outlook on the UN's potential for making the world 'a better and safer place for all its peoples'.

The objectives of the United Nations Association of Australia are to promote the aims and ideals of the UN among Australians by: developing policies which reflect an informed and critical analysis of global and UN issues; educating Australians about these issues and the work of the UN; enhancing the commitment of the Australian government to supporting the UN; and promoting international links. I have no doubt that *The New Agenda for Global Security: Cooperating for Peace and Beyond*, in taking up the issues dealt with in the *Blue Book* and subjecting them to critical scrutiny, will serve to further these important objectives and provide much additional scope for the ongoing debate and analysis that is so vital to our global future.

David Purnell  
National Administrator  
United Nations Association of Australia

# Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b>	iv
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	v
<b>Contributors</b>	vi
<b>Foreword</b> <i>David Purnell</i>	ix
<b>Introduction: Activating the Agenda</b> <i>Stephanie Lawson</i>	1
<b>1 From Collective to Cooperative Security? The Gareth Evans Vision of the United Nations</b> <i>Ramesh Thakur</i>	19
<b>2 The Core Assumptions and Presumptions of 'Cooperative Security'</b> <i>Peter Lawler</i>	39
<b>3 The 'New Mind-set of International Relations'? Security, Sovereignty and Responsibility in <i>Cooperating for Peace</i></b> <i>David Campbell</i>	59
<b>4 Arms Control Regimes: Some Critical Reflections</b> <i>Andrew Butfoy</i>	75
<b>5 Sanctions, Enforcement, and the Blue Book</b> <i>Richard Leaver</i>	89
<b>6 <i>Habitus in Cooperating for Peace: A Critique of Peacekeeping</i></b> <i>A.B. Fetherston</i>	101
<b>7 <i>Cooperating for Peace and Third World Sovereignty</i></b> <i>Samuel M. Makinda</i>	119
<b>8 Silences of the Blue Book</b> <i>Hilary Charlesworth</i>	133
<b>9 The Ethical Assumptions of the Blue Book</b> <i>Michael McKinley</i>	149
<b>10 Australia and Good International Citizenship</b> <i>David Goldsworthy</i>	171
<b>11 A Rejoinder</b> <i>Gareth Evans</i>	189
<b>Index</b>	205

---

# Introduction: Activating the Agenda

STEPHANIE LAWSON<sup>1</sup>

The end of the Cold War and superpower rivalry seemed to promise a fresh era of positive opportunities for international peace and security, with some entertaining the idea that we had survived the famous Confucian curse of 'living in interesting times'.<sup>2</sup> International relations scholars canvassed the idea of a new agenda for the discipline,<sup>3</sup> while on the policy side the transformation of superpower relations also prompted a fresh optimism that the United Nations could now achieve its basic objectives in the pursuit of global peace and security. This was reinforced by the mounting of collective action against Iraq which, for some, provided proof that 'the international community could indeed rally

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Greg Fry and David Sullivan for their very helpful comments on a draft of this Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> See Stephen John Stedman, 'The New Interventionists', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 1, 1992-93, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Fred Halliday, 'International Relations: Is There a New Agenda?', *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1, Spring 1991, pp. 57-72; Adam Roberts, 'A New Age in International Relations?', *International Affairs*, vol. 63, no.3, July 1991, pp. 509-25; Andrew Linklater, 'The Question of the Next Stage in International Relations Theory: A Critical Theoretical Point of View', *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, vol. 21, no. 1, Spring 1992, pp. 77-98; Richard Higgott and J.L. Richardson, eds, *International Relations: Global and Australian Perspectives on an Evolving Discipline*, Department of International Relations, Australian National University, Canberra, 1991, and K.J. Holsti, 'International Relations at the End of the Millenium', *Review of International Studies*, vol. 19, no. 4, October 1993, pp. 401-8.

against an aggressor who had violated the fundamental norms of international society'.<sup>4</sup> For others with the advantage of a little more hindsight, however, victory in the Gulf has been the 'one and only triumph' of the dream of a 'new world order' based on the ability of this community to implement collective security principles.<sup>5</sup>

Another aspect of new world order expectations was expressed most (in)famously by Francis Fukuyama who viewed the end of the Cold War, not simply as the close of a particular period of post-World War II history, but the end of history as such in the sense that serious ideological challenges to liberal democratic principles were effectively dead—and incapable of resurrection.<sup>6</sup> For those subscribing to the 'democratic peace thesis', that is, the proposition that liberal democracies do not fight each other and, just as importantly, are also far less likely to wage war against their own citizens, the putative spread of democratic values in the aftermath of the Cold War reinforced the promise of a peaceful future.

Six years later, one of the most commonly pronounced truisms is that although the prospect of major interstate warfare has receded significantly, the end of the Cold War has ushered in an era of deadly intrastate conflict. Contemporary expressions of nationalism have been harnessed to a revitalised concept of ethnicity and, in turn, these have fed into fresh formulations of the right to self-determination which is more often than not pursued in the name of history. There is no reason to view such developments as any less of an ideological threat to liberal democratic hopes for widespread peace and security. These developments have also posed many new and largely unexpected challenges for the United Nations and its agenda for global security, as well as for non-state actors in international politics concerned with establishing a more peaceful and just world order. Moreover, ongoing problems relating to arms control, trade in armaments (both legal and illegal), poverty and underdevelopment, Third World debt, large-scale environmental degradation, population pressures, resource exploitation and distribution, and human rights abuses remain matters of pressing concern. And unlike the narrower

---

<sup>4</sup> See Andrew Hurrell, 'Collective Security and International Order Revisited', *International Relations*, vol. XI, no. 1, April 1992, p. 37.

<sup>5</sup> Stanley Hoffmann, 'The Crisis of Liberal Internationalism', *Foreign Policy*, no. 98, Spring 1995, p. 167. For alternative assessments which do not cast the Gulf War as this kind of 'triumph' see Michael McKinley, ed., *The Gulf War: Critical Assessments*, Allen and Unwin and Department of International Relations, Australian National University, St Leonards and Canberra, 1994.

<sup>6</sup> See Francis Fukuyama, 'The End of History', *National Interest*, no. 16, Summer 1989; and 'A Reply to My Critics', *National Interest*, no. 18, Winter 1989.

Cold War security agendas, these issues are now more commonly accepted as legitimate items on the new agenda for global security.<sup>7</sup>

In confronting this array of urgent problems, it is generally acknowledged that policy-makers have been limited in their ability to respond effectively by the inadequacy not only of existing bureaucratic machinery, but also of particular 'mind-sets', both of which were developed in the very different environment of the Cold War bipolar order and its narrower, less inclusive agenda. Even so, there have been very high expectations expressed in some quarters of what the United Nations should be able to achieve in a world no longer dominated by superpower rivalry. Indeed, hopes for the establishment of a stable, peaceful international community have been declared very firmly in terms which place the United Nations at the heart of such a community: 'The world needs a centre, and some confidence that the centre is holding: The United Nations is the only credible candidate.'<sup>8</sup> New-school American interventionism, which has been described as combining an awareness that intrastate conflict is a legitimate concern for international security with 'a sentiment for crusading liberal internationalism' has taken a similar line insofar as it joins 'a great emphasis on the moral obligations of the international community to an eagerness for a newly available United Nations to intervene in domestic conflicts throughout the world'.<sup>9</sup>

More recently, however, louder voices in the United States are to be heard condemning the United Nations for over-reaching itself and for displaying incompetence in the face of growing demands. Moreover, the UN is frequently viewed by these commentators as 'a capricious foreign entity, acting independently of its member governments and often heedless of their concerns' with any show of autonomy by its Secretary-General tending to 'provoke cries of nationalist outrage, especially from the right'.<sup>10</sup> But as one commentator has argued, although cases like Bosnia and Somalia are likely to be regarded as 'flawed or even failed UN missions' in the long term, responsibility can be more accurately attributed to 'the lack of resolve in the United States and Europe, not [to]

---

<sup>7</sup> Some members of the Australian academic security studies community have been especially active in promoting broader conceptions. See, for example, Graeme Cheeseman and St John Kettle, eds, *The New Australian Militarism*, Pluto Press, Sydney, 1990 and Gary Smith and St John Kettle, eds, *Threats Without Enemies*, Pluto Press, Sydney, 1992.

<sup>8</sup> Canadian House of Commons, External Affairs Committee, quoted in Kevin Clements and Robin Ward, eds, *Building International Community: Cooperating for Peace Case Studies*, Allen and Unwin and Peace Research Centre, Australian National University, St Leonards and Canberra, 1994, p. 8.

<sup>9</sup> Stedman, 'The New Interventionists', pp. 1-2.

<sup>10</sup> See Brian Urquhart, 'Who Can Police the World?', *New York Review*, 12 May 1994, p. 29.

the failings of the secretary-general'.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, it has been suggested that the efficacy of UN actions depends on the consistency and cohesion in great power leadership:

When the powers are divided or predominantly reluctant, operations become fiascoes, as has been the case in Somalia and Bosnia, or too little too late, as in Rwanda (largely because of American pressure to keep intervention small in size and scope).<sup>12</sup>

Although the trend towards increased UN activism in recent years is often attributed to Boutros-Ghali's role, the UN Security Council has also displayed some initiative. Meeting for the first time at the Summit level of Heads of States and Governments in 1992, the Security Council asked the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the possibilities for enhancing the capacity of the United Nations to develop and pursue strategies for preventive diplomacy, peace making and peacekeeping. In considering the wide-ranging issues that such a report was meant to address, Boutros-Ghali added a further, closely related concept to the original three, that of post-conflict peace building. The result was *An Agenda for Peace*, a 50-page document providing analyses and recommendations relating to the strategies outlined above, as well as associated issues concerning regional organisations, the safety of UN personnel and, just as importantly, the ongoing problem of UN finances which has created a very large 'chasm' between what the UN is expected to achieve on the one hand, and its current financial abilities to meet those expectations on the other.<sup>13</sup>

The context within which Boutros-Ghali envisaged the further development and implementation of the *Agenda* upheld the traditional central organising principle of global relations, and of the UN itself: namely, the sovereign state. The prospects for 'common international progress', he said, remained grounded firmly in respect for its 'fundamental sovereignty and integrity'. But like his predecessor, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, Boutros-Ghali also stressed the extent to which the sove-

---

<sup>11</sup> Stanley Meisler, 'Dateline U.N.: A New Hammarskjöld?', *Foreign Policy*, no. 98, Spring 1995, p. 193. Meisler also notes that the Clinton administration, in playing to its domestic audience, 'largely succeeded in deluding the American public into believing it was Boutros-Ghali alone who led American soldiers to disaster in Somalia' (p. 181).

<sup>12</sup> Hoffmann, 'The Crisis of Liberal Internationalism', p. 172. For a recent overview and critical discussion of humanitarian interventions and the inconsistency of US policy, see Thomas G. Weiss, 'Overcoming the Somalia Syndrome—"Operation Rekindle Hope?"', *Global Governance*, vol. 1, no. 2, May–August 1995, pp. 171–87.

<sup>13</sup> Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*, Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992, New York, United Nations, 1992.

reignty principle—the theory of which has never in any case been matched by the reality—needed to be reassessed and balanced by equally important ethical considerations relating to what goes on inside state borders.<sup>14</sup> Thus a commitment to human rights and good governance within states, along with ‘promoting the empowerment of the unorganized, the poor, [and] the marginalized’ were emphasised as primary goals of the UN, and therefore legitimate issues on the agenda for global security. Moreover, he said, the UN’s focus ‘should be on the “field”, the locations where economic, social and political decisions take effect’.<sup>15</sup> The distinct message was that the UN must endeavour to promote peace, understood not simply as the absence of war, but peace as justice in a much broader sense. In turn, this must inform a notion of security that goes well beyond traditional concerns with military threats to state borders, and provides a more adequate conceptual basis for preventive approaches to potential security crises.

Many of these ideas were not especially new to peace researchers and students of international politics more generally, but in terms of placing them at the forefront of UN concerns and responsibilities, the Secretary-General’s report provided a fresh impetus to thinking, particularly among the policy community, about the new post-Cold War agenda for global security and the important role that the UN could play in activating that agenda. As Boutros-Ghali reports in a later publication, the ideas and recommendations put forward in the *Agenda* have been debated in the parliaments of member states, studied in ministries, non-governmental and private organisations, and publicised and commented on widely in the media. They have also resulted in UN statements and resolutions (in both the Security Council and General Assembly) concerning peacekeeping and preventive diplomacy in particular.<sup>16</sup>

Gareth Evans introduces *Cooperating For Peace: The Global Agenda for the 1990s and Beyond*, otherwise known as the ‘Blue Book’, as an Australian contribution to the ongoing international debate stimulated by Boutros-Ghali’s report. As Evans notes in his preface, the latter was produced at a time when confidence in the UN’s capacities and abilities as a leader in security cooperation was relatively high following its recent ‘success’ in spearheading a collective response to Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, and in organising the largest ever peacekeeping operation in

---

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.* p. 9.

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.* p. 47. More recently, Boutros-Ghali has also linked the all-embracing concept of ‘culture’ (and cultural rights) to the global mission of the UN. See Boutros-Ghali, ‘Unity and Diversity: The Contemporary Challenge’, text of speech delivered to the Global Cultural Diversity Conference, Sydney, 26 April 1995.

<sup>16</sup> Boutros-Ghali, ‘An Agenda for Peace: One Year Later’, *Orbis*, vol. 37, no. 3, Summer 1993, p. 323.