Peacekeeping in the Middle East as an International Regime

Kenneth R. Dombroski

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Studies in International Relations

Edited by
Charles MacDonald
Florida International University

A Routledge Series

Peacekeeping in the Middle East as an International Regime

Kenneth R. Dombroski

Routledge
New York & London

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
270 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
2 Park Square
Milton Park, Abingdon
Oxon OX14 4RN

© 2007 by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2007.

"To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk."

International Standard Book Number-10: 0-415-98105-0 (Hardcover)
International Standard Book Number-13: 978-0-415-98105-7 (Hardcover)

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dombroski, Kenneth R.
Peacekeeping in the Middle East as an international regime / Kenneth R. Dombroski.
p. cm. -- (Studies in international relations)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-0-415-98105-7 (alk. paper)
1. Arab-Israeli conflict--1993---Peace. 2. Peace-keeping--Middle East--International cooperation. 3. Peace-keeping--Middle East--History. 4. Conflict management--Middle East--International cooperation. 5. Conflict managment--Middle East--History. I. Title.

DS119.76.D66 2006
956.05--dc22 2006025981

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
http://www.taylorandfrancis.com

and the Routledge Web site at
http://www.routledge-ny.com

ISBN 0-203-94436-4 Master e-book ISBN

Contents

List of Tables ix

Glossary xi

Preface xiii

Introduction 1

Chapter One
Peacekeeping as an International Regime 7

Chapter Two
The Genesis of a Middle East Peacekeeping Regime 25

Chapter Three
Establishing the Middle East Peacekeeping Regime 39

Chapter Four
The Evolution of the Peacekeeping Regime during the Cold War 69

Chapter Five
Peacekeeping in the New World Order, 1988–1994 99

Chapter Six
Peacekeeping in the Middle East Reconsidered 121

Appendix A 139

Appendix B 141

Notes 143

Bibliography 171

Index 183

List of Tables

Table 1	Summary of Peacekeeping Missions in the Middle East Peacekeeping Regime	94
Table 2	Israel's Attitude toward the Middle East Peacekeeping Regime	126
Table 3	Evolution of the Middle East Peacekeeping Regime	132
Table 4	Effectiveness of the Middle East Peacekeeping Regime Reconsidered	133

Introduction

> The nonviolent nature of United Nations peacekeeping operations is at the same time their most important and their least understood characteristic. . . . The principle of nonviolence sets peacekeeping forces above the conflict they are dealing with: Violation of the principle almost invariably leads to the peacekeepers becoming part of the conflict and therefore part of the problem.
>
> Brian Urquhart[1]

THE PROBLEMS OF PEACEKEEPING

What is peacekeeping? During the Cold War the image of a blue-helmeted Scandinavian or Canadian sentry guarding a buffer zone in the Sinai, on the Golan Heights or on Cyprus typified the mind's eye view of traditional peacekeeping for over forty years. By 1995, the image of U.S. fighter aircraft conducting North Atlantic Treaty Organization-directed air strikes while British artillery fired in support of French United Nations armored forces in Bosnia had not only blurred this traditional notion of contemporary peacekeeping, but called into question the purpose and efficacy of such operations among academics and policy makers alike.

After the dramatic failures in Somalia and Bosnia, the prestige of the United Nations in conducting peacekeeping operations was at its lowest point in years. As Chester Crocker pointed out in 1994: "A backlash against United Nations peace operations is in full swing in America." The Republican-controlled House of Representatives pushed to reduce the U.S. contribution to the United Nations peacekeeping budget from thirty-three to twenty-five per cent, and to strictly limit involvement of American troops

in United Nations peacekeeping operations. "Gone is the 1992-93 euphoria in Washington and New York over a new, more assertive and, if necessary, more muscular multilateralism."[2]

One of the most significant and divisive debates in the field of world politics concerns the importance of international institutions. Realists argue that such institutions are unimportant because the foreign policy actions of states are based on self-interest, while liberal institutionalists argue that institutions do indeed matter because they can influence and alter state behavior, thus becoming a cause of peace. The challenge for both schools of thought is to provide sufficient empirical evidence to support their approach while offering evidence to contest that of their rivals. To date, neither school has prevailed nor has the debate been settled.[3]

This study investigates the research question: Can an international institution influence state behavior and thereby contribute to the peaceful resolution of a conflict? This research focuses on the series of interrelated peacekeeping efforts undertaken to help resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict from 1948 to 1994, in an effort to determine the relative importance of institutions in a state-centric international system.

A secondary purpose is to offer some conceptual clarity to the study of peacekeeping by describing and explaining the evolution of peacekeeping operations carried out during and immediately after the Cold War in the Middle East in terms of an international regime. The relevance of this approach to studying peacekeeping is becoming more obvious as the multiple peacekeeping missions conducted in the former Yugoslavia, Congo, Haiti, and East Timor, among others, demonstrate the interrelationship between the missions themselves and the overarching goal of restoring peace in those volatile regions. In complex conflicts involving multiple actors, a study of the relationship between sequential peacekeeping operations and the advancement of peace is likely to produce a richer and more comprehensive picture of the long-term effects of these operations on state behavior than can be derived from discrete case studies of individual missions.

WHY ANOTHER STUDY OF PEACEKEEPING?

Existing studies of peacekeeping in the Middle East have concentrated on only one or a very limited number of case studies. The insights they provide do not allow for broader generalizations about peacekeeping.[4] Those studies that did look more broadly at peacekeeping operations tended to be primarily descriptive or historical narratives comparing various types of operations, many of which were not adequately defined as peacekeeping missions.[5] Most of the rest are either out of date or based on such limited

data sets that their conclusions are in need of revalidation to account for the changes to the international environment since the end of the Cold War.[6]

Although the scholarly literature on peacekeeping has significantly increased in volume since the end of the Cold War, it has provided insufficient evidence to help resolve the realist-institutionalist debate on the importance of international institutions. Most contemporary authors in the field use comparative analysis of discrete case studies to develop generalized statements about causal relationships that apply to the whole universe of peacekeeping missions.[7] This approach has several significant limitations. First, because the cases are treated as discrete, their relation to each other in time is not fully examined. Second, these analyses do not designate a crucial case that constitutes a prototype for peacekeeping missions.[8] Third, particularly in the cases involving the Arab-Israeli conflict, discrete cases do not provide sufficient long-term evidence to determine whether peacekeeping missions had a significant impact on state behavior and led to the peaceful resolution of conflict.

An alternative approach to evaluating the long-term effects of peacekeeping missions on state behavior, and the effects of varying state behavior on peacekeeping missions, is to reduce the universe of missions to well-defined subsets. Of the peacekeeping missions conducted between 1948 and 1994, those that involved Israel and one or more of her neighbors constitute such a clear subset. Additionally, focusing on this subset of peacekeeping missions will allow closer examination of their relation to each other in time, and facilitates the identification of a crucial case that can constitute a prototype.

This study offers an alternative approach to the analysis of international peacekeeping that evaluates the long-term effects of peacekeeping on state behavior, and concomitantly, the effects of varying state behavior on an international regime. The findings of this study offer new perspectives on the relative importance of regimes, the utility of regime analysis in explaining the importance of international institutions, the significance of a peacekeeping regime's role in influencing state behavior, and the effect of varying state behavior on regime evolution. The thesis of this study is that the individual peacekeeping missions conducted in the Middle East to deal with the Arab-Israeli conflict can be conceptualized as components of a Middle East peacekeeping regime, which in turn is a subset of, and operates within the "policy spaces"[9] defined by, a broader international peacekeeping regime. While some studies cover several of the United Nations peacekeeping missions, no study to date treats all these peacekeeping operations in the Middle East, including the non-United Nations missions, as part of a distinct international regime.[10] Indeed, few contemporary authors who